



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 33]
No. 33]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अगस्त 13, 1994/श्रावण 22, 1916
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1994/SRAVANA 22, 1916

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि, न्याय और कंपनी कार्य मंत्रालय

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(विधि कार्य विभाग)

(Department of Legal Affairs)

(Judicial Section)

NOTICE

सूचना

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1994

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1994

का०आ०1884.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री एम० रहमान एडवोकेट (महबूब-उल-रहमान सिद्दीकी) ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्षित सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से भेरे पास भेजा जाए।

S.O. 1884.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri M. Rahman (Mahboob-Ul-Rahman Siddiqui), Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[F. No. 5(87)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1994

[सं० 5(87)/94-न्यायिक]
पी०सी० कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

का०आ०1885.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री ए०वी० मेनेजस एडवोकेट ने उक्त

प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे वसाई तालुका, थाणे जिला (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 3(88)/94-न्यायिक]

पी०सी० कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1994

S.O. 1885.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules by Shri A. V. Menzes, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Taluka Vasai Distt. Thane (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[F. No. 5(88)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1994

का०आ० 1886.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री एस०जी० मुस्कारा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कलकत्ता हाई कोर्ट (पश्चिम बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(89)/94-न्यायिक]

पी०सी० कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1994

S.O. 1886.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules by Shri S. G. Muskan, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Calcutta High Court (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[F. No. 5(89)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1994

का०आ० 1887.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती

है कि श्री तरुण कान्ति चौधुरी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सिटी, सिविल और सेशन कोर्ट, 2 और 3 किरन शंकर राय रोड, कलकत्ता (पश्चिम बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(90)/94-न्यायिक]

पी०सी० कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1994

S.O. 1887.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules by Shri Tarun Kante Chaudhuri, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in City Civil & Session Court, 2 & 3 Kiran Sankar Roy Road, Calcutta (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[F. No. 5(90)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

कार्मिक, लोक शिकापत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1994

का०आ० 1888.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं० 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए बिहार राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना जापन सं० 3/सी-4-10395/93- (पार्ट) एच (पी) 1868 दिनांक 4-3-1994 द्वारा प्राप्त बिहार राज्य सरकार की सहमति से श्री डी०जी० गोपाल की हत्या से संबंधित थाना बिस्फुपुर जिला जमशेदपुर के मामले सं० 346/93 तथा उक्त अपराधों के संबंध में अथवा उनसे संसन्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और षड्यंत्रों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार करती है।

[सं० 228/11/94-ए०बी०डी०-II]

आर०एस० बिष्ट, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel & Training)

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1994

S.O. 1888.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Govern-

ment of Bihar accorded vide Notification Memo No. 3/C-4-10395/93(Part)H(P) 1668 dated 4-3-1994 hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment for investigation of the Bistupur P.S. Case No. 346/93, Dist. Janshedpur which is connected with the murder of Shri V. G. Gopal, and attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences

[No. 228/11/94-AVD-II]

R. S. BISHT, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) का कार्यालय

कलकत्ता, 18 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1889.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिये, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित अधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्थान" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिये अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।

(2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

(3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है, और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों से सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

कृष्णामूर्ति फाउन्डेशन, भारत,

बसन्त बिहार,

64-65, गीनबेज रोड,

मद्रास-600028

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिये लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूचित किया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिये आयकर

आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किये आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करनी हैं।

[संख्या 770(एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/टी. एम 7/कल./35(1) (iii) 90-91)]

ए.के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

Office of the Director General of Income Tax (Exemptions)

Calcutta, the 18th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1889.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Krishnamurti Foundation India, Vasanta Vihar, 64-65, Greenways Road, Madras-600028.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 770(F. No. DG/IT(E)/TN-7/Cal/35(1)(iii)90-91)]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करनी है।

कलकत्ता, 18 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

[संख्या : 771(एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.क.(छूट)/एम.-59/कल./35(1)(ii)/90-91)]

ए.के. बिश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 18th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1890.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Indian Cancer Society, National Hqrs., 74, Jorbat Wadia Road, Parel, Bombay-12.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 771 (F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-39/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91)]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy Director

कलकत्ता, 18 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1891.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के

का.आ. 1890.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिये, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिये अलग लेखा-बहीयां रखेगा।

(2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

(3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्तूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों से सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

इंडियन कैंसर सोसायटी
राष्ट्रीय मुख्यालय
74, जैरबाई वाडिया रोड,
पारेल, बंबई - 12

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिये लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिये आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किये आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और

लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा ;

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा ; और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

श्री बी.बी. पटेल फारमासियुटिकल शिक्षा तथा रिसर्च विकास केन्द्र,
73, संजीव बाग, न्यू शारदा मंदिर रोड,
अहमदाबाद-380054

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-91 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किये आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 772/एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/जी-31/
35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए.के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 18th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1891.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax

Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

(i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities ;

(ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and

(iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Shri B. V. Patel Pharmaceuticals Education and Research Development Centre, 73, Sanjiv Baug, New Sharda Mandir Road, Ahmedabad-380054.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-91 to 31-3-93.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 772/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-31/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 19 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1892.—तर्वासाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के लिये, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिये अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा ;

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा ; और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान

विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

काउंसिल फॉर पावर यूटिलिटी,
सी.बी.आई. तथा पी.बिल्डिंग, माल्हा मार्ग,
चाणक्यापुरी, नई दिल्ली-110021

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-91 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रयोग के लिये लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूचना दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिये आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता, को तीन प्रतिशों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किये आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 773/एफ.सं. न.नि./आ.क. (छूट) न.दि.
63/कल/35(1)(ii) 90-91]

प्र.के. बिश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 19th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1892.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax (Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Council for Power Utilities,
CBI & P Buildings, Malcha Marg, Chanakyapuri, New
Delhi-110021.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-91 to 31-3-94.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax (Director of Income-tax (Exemptions)) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 773/F. No. DG/IT(E)/ND-63/Ca/35(1)(ii)90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 25 जनवरी, 1994

आयकर

का.आ. 1893:—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के बण्ड (ii) के लिये, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिये अवग लेखा बहियां रखेगा ;

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", म्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा; और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों संबंधित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

सोसायटी फॉर हेल्थ एनर्जई रिसर्च एंजुकेशन इंडिया,
(गोर इंडिया) 1-7-293, एम.जी. रोड, सिकन्दरा-
बाद-500003

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिये प्रभावी है।

कलकत्ता, 25 जनवरी, 1993

(आयकर)

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिये लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिये आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतिशत में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किये आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 774/एफ.ए. न. नि./आ.क. (छूट)/ए.पी. II/
कन. 39(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए.के. बिस्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta the 25th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1893.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; &
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Society for Health Allied Research and Education India.
(Share India) 1-7-293,
M. G. Road, Secundrabad-500003.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 774/P. No. DG/IT(E)/AP-11/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

का.आ. 1894.—सर्वसाधारण को सूचना के लिये एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचना जारी किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिये, आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर प्रवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है।

1. संगठन वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये प्राप्त धन के लिये एक अलग लेखा रखेगा ;

2. वह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यकलापों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये, प्रत्येक वर्ष को 31 मई तक, सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "औद्योगिक भवन", न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा ; और

3. वह प्रत्येक वर्ष को 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों को प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक आयुक्त और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च क्रिया-कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

लेडी अनसूवा सिद्धान्ता मेडिकल रिसर्च सोसाइटी,
जयकम नगर, कोटा-324003
राजस्थान

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतिशत में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव,

वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[सं. 775/फा. सं. डी. जी. आ. कर (छूट) : आर-1/कल. 35/(1)/(ii)/90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta the 25th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1894.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, Technology Bhawan, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October, each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Lady Ansuya Singhania Medical Research Society,
Jaykay Nagar, Kota-324003,
Rajasthan.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-95.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 775/F. No. DG/IT(E)/R-1/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 25 जनवरी, 1993

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1895.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के अन्तर्गत, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहिया रखेगा;

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा; और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिस्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आभ-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

वसन्तिदादा शुगर संस्थान,
मनारी (सी. के.), 412307, तालुक हवेली,
जिला पुणे, महाराष्ट्र

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक ब. अधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 776/एफ. सं. म. नि. आ. क. (छूट)/एम. 51/

कल. 35(1) (ii)/90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta the 25th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1895.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;

(ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and

(iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October, each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Vasantidada Sugar Institute,
Manjari (BK), 412307, Tan : Haveli,
Dist. Pune. Maharashtra.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 776/F. No. DG IT(E)/M-51/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 25 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

क्र.आ. 1896.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35, की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के लिए आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहिया रखेगा।

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू महरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली 110016 को भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक, (छूट) (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक

1774 GI/94—2

(छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है, और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-अध्ययन हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

इलेक्ट्रानिक्स रिसर्च और विकास, केन्द्र, पुणे एस. आई. डी. आई. स्थान, कृषि कॉलेज कंपाउंड, पुणे-411005. यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 3-9-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्तें (i) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है, के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 777/एफ. सं. म. नि./आ.क. (छूट)/आर 157/35 (1)(ii)/90-91]

ए. के. बिश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta the 25th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1896.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

(i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;

(ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; &

(iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/ Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October, each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of the audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Electronics Research and Development,
Centre, Pune, S.I.D.I. Premises,
Agricultural College Compound,
Pune-411005.

This Notification is effective for the period from 3-9-1992 to 31-3-94.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 777/F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-157/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 28 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. भा. 1897.—सर्वसाधारण को सूचना के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचना जारी किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिये, आयकर नियम 1962 के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर प्रवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है।

1. संगठन वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये प्राप्त धन के लिये एक अलग लेखा रखेगा।

2. यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यकलापों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये, प्रत्येक वर्ष को 31 मई तक, सचिव वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "औद्योगिक भवन" न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा।

3. यह प्रत्येक वर्ष को 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों को प्रति : (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक आयुक्त, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च क्रिया-कलाप से सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

नेशनल इंस्टीट्यूट्स एकादमी,
एस. नं. 25, बानेर रोड,
बलिज ब्रेलेबाडी, तलुका हवेली,
जिला पूणे, पिन, 111008

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/

आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[सं. 778/का. सं. म.न./आ.कर (छूट)/एम 149/कल/ 35 (1) (ii) 90-91]

ए. के. बिस्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 28th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1897.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

(i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;

(ii) it will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and

(iii) It will submit to the : (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research; and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

National Insurance Academy,
S. No 25, Baner Road,
Village Balewadi Taluka Haveli,
Dist. Pune, PIN-411008.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 778/F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-149/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 29 जनवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. भा. 1898.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर

अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" "संघ" के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा ।

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली 110016 को भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों से सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा ।

संगठन का नाम

बी.एम. बिरला, हार्ट रिसर्च सेंटर

1/1 नेशनल लाइब्रेरी ऐवन्यू, कलकत्ता 27

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है ।

टिप्पणी :—(1) उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा संघ के लिए लागू नहीं होगा ।

(2) संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है ।

[संख्या 779/एफ सं. म. नि/आ क (छूट)/कल./प. सं. 14/35 (1) (ii) /90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 29th January, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1898.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

(i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;

(ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each; and

(iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of the audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

B. M. Birla Heart Research Centre,
1/1, National Library Avenue,
Calcutta-27.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 779/E. No. DG/IT(E)/Cal/WB-14/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 1 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1899.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संघ के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा ।

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली 110016 को भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और

आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

हैदराबाद विज्ञान सोसाइटी,
मेहदीपटनम, हैदराबाद 500028

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—(1) उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

- (2) संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट), उनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियां में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां मंचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 780/एफ. सं. म. नि. /आ. क (छूट)/
ए. पी. 1/ 35 (1) (ii)/90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 1st February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1899.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions); (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Hyderabad Science Society,
Mehdipatnam, Hyderabad,
Hyderabad-500 028.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

NOTES: 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 780/F. No. DG/IT(E)/AP-1/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 12 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1900:—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अंतर्गत अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

- संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

गुजरात मेथोडिस्ट चर्च कार्डियोथेरेसिक और वास्क्यूलर रिसर्च सोसाइटी,
मिशन रोड, नाडियाड-387001, गुजरात

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-10-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां, सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 781/एफ. सं. म. नि. /आ. क. (छूट)/जी.
53/35 (1) (ii) / 90-91]
पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 12th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1900.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Gujarat Methodist Church Cardiotheracic and Vascular Research Society, Mission Road, Nadiad-387001, Gujarat.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-10-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

- The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 781/F. No. DG/TT(E)/G-53/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 12 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1901.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिस्च कार्यों से सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में में लेखा परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

नेशनल इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ पब्लिक वेल तथा पालिसी 18/2, यूनसंग बिहार मार्ग, स्पेमान इंस्टीट्यूशनल क्षेत्र, नई दिल्ली-110067

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-89 से 31-3-92 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्तें (i) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

- संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 782/एफ. सं. म. नि. /आ. क. (छूट)/एन. डी. /
72/कल. / 35 (1) (iii) / 90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 12th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1901.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

National Institute of Public Finance & Policy 18/2, Satsang Vihar Marg, Special Institutional Area, New Delhi-110067.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-89 to 31-3-92.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 782/F. No. DG/IT(E)/ND-72/Cal/35(1)(iii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 12 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1902 :—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग,

"प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली —110016 को भेजेगा और

- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

डाबर अनुसंधान फाउन्डेशन,
8/3, आसिफ अली रोड,
नई दिल्ली—110002

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 783/एफ. सं. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट) एन. डी.-84/कल./35(1)(ii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 12th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1902.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and

- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Dabur Research Foundation,
8/3, Asaf Ali Road,
New Delhi-110002.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTE : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 783/F. No. DG/IT(E)/ND-94/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 23 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1903:—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली—110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

जगदेल वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान फाउण्डेशन,
35, संपांगनी टैंक रोड,
बंगलूर—560027

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि व अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 784/एफ. स. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट) / के. टी. 10/कल. 35 (1) (ii) / 90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 23rd February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1903.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Jagdale Scientific Research Foundation,
35, Sampangi Tank Road,
Bangalore-560027.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTE : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the

approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 784/F. No. DG/IT(E)/KT-10/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 23 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1904.—सर्वसाधारण को सूचना के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचना जारी किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर “संस्था” प्रवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है।

1. संगठन वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिये प्राप्त धन के लिए एक अलग लेखा रखेगा।
2. यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्य-कलापों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष को 31 मई तक, सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग “औद्योगिक भवन”, न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा।
3. यह प्रत्येक वर्ष को 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों को प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक आयुक्त और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसंच क्रिया-कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

सन्धता मेडिकल रिसर्च सोसाइटी,
एक्सटेंशन एरिया,
मिराज- 416410
महाराष्ट्र

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक को अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—

1. उपयुक्त शर्त (1) “संघ” जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।
2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन

पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[च. 785/फा. सं. म. नि./आ. कर (छूट)
एम-44/कल/ 35 (1) (ii) / 90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उप निदेशक

Calcutta, the 23rd February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1904.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category “Association” subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Sandhata Medical Research Society,
Extension Area,
Miraj-416410,
Maharashtra.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTE : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 785/F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-44/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 23 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1905.—सर्वसाधारण को ए द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन

विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्य के लिए, अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई निम्न कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

डालमिया इंस्टिट्यूट आफ़ विज्ञान तथा प्रौद्योगिकी
रिसर्च, पोस्ट बाक्स नं. 2, राजगंजपुरा,
जिला सुन्दरगाह, उड़ीसा

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-1992 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी:—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संव" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगी।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि व अनुमोदित की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदित की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में कि, आवेदन—पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 786/एफ. सं. सं. नि./आ. क (छूट)/सी-1/
कल/35 (1) (ii) 90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 23rd February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1905.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1)

1774 GI/94 - 3

of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Inspector of Income-tax (Exemption) having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Dalmia Institute of Scientific & Industrial,
Research, Post Box No. 2,
Raigangpur-770017,
Dist. Sundargarh (Orissa).

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES: 1—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemption) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 786/F. No. DG/ITE/C-1/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 24 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1906.—सर्व माधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संव" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट),

(ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और
(ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिस्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ किडनी डिजिज और रिसर्च
बी. जे. मेडिकल कॉलेज और अस्पताल सेंटर,
नया ब्लाक, ग्राउंड फ्लोर,
अहमदाबाद-380016
गुजरात

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1 उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करने, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां मविद, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[बंख्या : 787/एफ. सं. म. नि./आ.क. (छूट) जी-1/
कल. 35(1) (ii) 90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 24th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1906.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; &
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted

under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Institute of Kidney Diseases & Research,
Centre, B. J. Medical College & Hospital,
New Block, Ground Floor,
Ahmedabad-380016, Gujarat State (India).

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 787/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-1/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1907.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखाबहियां रखेगा।

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(i) में दी गई रिस्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

डा. रेड्डी रिसर्च फाउन्डेशन
(स्टेन्डर्ड रिसर्च केंद्र)
7-1-27, अमीरपेट,
हैदराबाद-16

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

कलकत्ता 26 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 788/एफ. सं. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट)/ए. पी. 17/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1907.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Dr. Reddy's Research Foundation,
Standard Research Centre,
7-1-27, Ameerpet,
Hyderabad-16.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES : 1.—Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply intrepicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 788/I. No. DG/IT(E)/AP-17/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

का.आ. 1908.— सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहिया रखेगा,

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बंधी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, प्रौद्योगिक भवन, न्यू मेहरौली रोड नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धी (छूट) के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब की भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

श्री अरविंद आश्रम ट्रस्ट, पांडीचेरी

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-93 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 789/(एफ सं. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट)/पैड 3/कल./35(1)(ii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1908.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961,

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust, Pondicherry.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-93 to 31-3-94.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 789/F. No. DG/IT(E)/Pond-3/Cal[35(1)(ii)]90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 फरवरी, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1909.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव वैज्ञानिक व

औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली 110016 को भेजेगा; और

- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

सेरम इंस्टीट्यूट आफ इंडिया रिसर्च फाउन्डेशन/ सारांश भवन 16-बी 1 डा. अंबेडकर रोड पुणे-411001

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-93 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[सं 790/एक. सं. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट)/एम 41/कल/35(1)

(ii) 90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1909.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;

(ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and

(iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Serum Institute of India Research Foundation, Sarosh Bhawan, 16-B/1, Dr. Ambedkar Road, Pune-411001.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-93 to 31-3-94.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 790/E. No. DG/IT(E)/M-41/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 1 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1910.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई, तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और

आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमर्स कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षण आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

पान एशियन मैनेजमेंट आर ररल रिसर्च संगठन,
3 सी/22, रोहताक रोड, नई दिल्ली-110005

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन को अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां, सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 791/एफ.सं. म.नि./अ.क. (छूट)/एन.डी.-65/कलकत्ता-35(1)(iii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 1st March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1910.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purpose of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

(i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;

(ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and

(iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Pan Asian Management and Rural Research Organisation,
3C/22, Rohatak Road, New Delhi-110005.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 791/F. No. DG/IT(E)/ND-65/Cal/35(1)(iii)/90-91]
P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1911—सर्वसाधारण को एनद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग अर्थात् अनुमोदित किया गया है।

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहीया रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई, तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रायोगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा। और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्तूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

फाई रिमर्श इंस्टीट्यूट,
गंगानगर पी.ओ., इच्छनकरणजी, 416116
महाराष्ट्र (भारत)

यह अधिमूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/

आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है कि माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करे, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र को 6 प्रतियां सचिव वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[सं. 792/एफ.सं.सं.मां.नं./आ.कं.(छूट)/एम.०
74/कल.० 35(1)(ii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th February, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1911.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Fie Research Institute, Ganganagar P. O. Ichalkaranji-416116, Maharashtra (India).

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply triplicate well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 792/F. No. DC/IT(E)/M-74/Cal/35(1)(iii)/90-91]
P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 2 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1912—सर्वसाधारण को एनद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के

खण्ड (ii) के लिए आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहिया रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली 110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमार्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

कैंसर केर ट्रस्ट आफ रिमार्च फाउन्डेशन
3/1 गेम कोर्स रोड,
इंदोर-452003 (मध्य प्रदेश)

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करता है।

[संख्या 793/एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.क.(छूट)/एम.पी. 3/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 2nd March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1912.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Cancer Care Trust & Research Foundation,
3/1, Race Course Road, Indore-452003(M.P.).

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-93 to 31-3-94.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 793/E. No. DGIT(E)/MP-3/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 4 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1913 :—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 मई तक सचिव वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

विवेकानंद मेडिकल रिसर्च सोसाइटी लाटूर, विद्यानगर महाराष्ट्र।

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करता है।

[संख्या : 794/एफ. सं. म. नि. /अ. क. (छूट) /एस.-15/
कल./35 (1) (ii)/90-91]
पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 4th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1913.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of

audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Vivekanand Medical Research Society, Latur, Vidya Nagar, Maharashtra.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 794/F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-15/Cal/35(1)(ii)||90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 5 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1914.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "यूनिवर्सिटी" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिमर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

श्री मत्स्य साय इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ लारनिंग
प्रसन्ननिनाग्रम 515134
अनंतपुर जिला (आ.प्र.)

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

कलकत्ता, 17 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संव" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 795/एफ.गं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/ए.पी. - 5/कल./35 (1) (ii)/90-91]

पी. अग्रवाल, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 5th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1914.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "University" subject to the following condition :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Sti Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning, Prasanthi-nilayam-515134, Anantapur Dt. (A. P.).

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 795/F. No. DG/IT(E)/AP-5/Cal[35(1)(ii)/90-91]

P. AGARWAL, Dy. Director

1774 GI/94-2

का.आ. 1915 :—सर्वसाधारण की एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "विश्वविद्यालय" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिस्सा को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

जामिया इमदद यूनिवर्सिटी,

पी.उ. इमदद नगर,

नई दिल्ली-110062

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 6-5-91 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संव" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 796/एफ.गं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/एन.

डी. 91/35 (1) (ii)/90-91]

ए.क. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 17th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1915.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "University" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Jamia Hamdard, Versity, P. O. Hamdard Nagar, New Delhi-110062.

This Notification is effective for the period from 6-5-91 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 796/F. No. DG/IT(E)/91/935(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 17 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ 1916 :—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों को एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक

(छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

कनसेलटेन्सी विकास केन्द्र,
कुतुब होटल, एपार्टमेंट-ई-1,
नया मेहरोली रोड,
नई दिल्ली-110016

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 9-1-91 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 797/एफ सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/एन.डी./93/35 (1) (iii)/90-91]
ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 17th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1916.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of

its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Consultancy Development Centre, Qutab Hotel, Apartment E-I, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016.

This Notification is effective for the period from 9-1-91 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 797/F. No. DG/IT(E)/ND-93/35(1)(iii)/90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 19 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1917:- सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :-

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिक भवन", न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमात्र को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

टाटा एनर्जी रिसर्च इंस्टिट्यूट,
7 जोरबाग, नई दिल्ली-110003

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संव" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के सम्बन्ध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 798 /एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/
न.वि.-82/कल./35(1) (ii) /90-91]

ए.के. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta, the 19th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1917.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Tata Energy Research Institute, 7, Jorbagh, New Delhi-110003.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 798/F. No. DG/IT(E)/ND-82/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 19 मार्च, 1993

Calcutta, the 19th March, 1993
INCOME TAX

आयकर

का.आ. 1918—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर “संघ” संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :-

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, “प्रौद्योगिकी भवन” न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखापरीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

एम.एस. स्वामीनाथन रिसर्च फाउंडेशन,
11 रत्न नगर, टयनामपेट,
मद्रास,

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

- टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) “संघ” संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।
2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 799/एफ सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/टी.
एन./5/35 (1) (ii) /90-91]

ए० के० विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

S.O. 1918.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category “Association” subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, ‘Technology Bhawan’, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

M. S. Swaminathan Research Foundation, 11, Rathna Nagar, Teynampet, Madras.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 799/F. No. DG/IT(E)/TN-5/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 19 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1919—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर “संघ” संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :-

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, “प्रौद्योगिकी भवन” न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

होस्तोमाल सांचेटी रिसर्च फाउंडेशन,
16, शिवाजी नगर,
पुणे-411005

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-90 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होता।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 800/एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/एम.
92/35 (1) (ii)/90-91]

ए.के. बिष्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 19th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1919—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect

of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Hostimal Sancheti Research Foundation, 16, Shivaji-nagar, Pune-411005.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction for extension of approval. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 800/F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-92/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 23 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1920 :- सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन, न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

इन्सटिट्यूट ऑफ कंपनी सेक्रेटरीज, आफ इंडिया,
आई सी एस आई हाउस,
22, इन्स्टिट्यूशनल एरिया,
सोदी रोड, नई दिल्ली-110003

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-91 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संव" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 801/एफ. सं. म. नि./आ.क. (छूट)/एन. डी-14 35(1) (iii)/90-91]

ए.के. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta, the 23rd March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1920.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION:

The Institute of Company Secretaries of India, 'ICSI House', 22, Institutional Area, Lodi Road, New Delhi-110003.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes: 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 801/F- No DG/IT(E)/ND-14/35(1)(iii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 24 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1920:- सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 25 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :-

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहीयां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

भगवान महावीर मेडिकल रिसर्च सेंटर,
10-1-1, महावीर मार्ग,
हैदराबाद-500004 (ए.पी.)

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संव" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 802/एफ.सं. म. नि./आ.क. (छूट)/
ए.पी.-4/कल., 35 (1) (ii)/90-91]

ए.के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 24th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1921.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of its audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Bhagavan Mahavir Medical Research Centre, 10-1-1, Mahavir Marg, Hyderabad-500004 (A. P.).

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 802/F. No. DG/IT(E)/AP-4/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 23 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1922:— सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "विश्वविद्यालय" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा ; और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखाकी प्रति (क) आयकर महा निदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिमार्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब का भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

गुजरात विद्यापीठ,
आश्रम रोड,
अहमदाबाद-380014 गुजरात

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक को अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूझा दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट), जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता का तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग का प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 803/एफ. सं. स. नि./आ. क. (छूट)/जी.-
29/35 (1) (ii)/9-0-91]

के.ए. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta, the 23rd March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1922.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "University" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its

audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Gujarat Vidyapith, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380 014, Gujarat.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No 803/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-29/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 24 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1923.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर “विश्व-विद्यालय” संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, “प्रौद्योगिकी भवन” न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई निम्न कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब की भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

गुजरात विद्यापीठ, आश्रम रोड, अहमदाबाद-380 014
गुजरात

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) “संघ” जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियां में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 804/(एफ.सं. म.नि./आ.का. (छूट)/जी-29/कल./35(1)(iii)/90-91)]

ए.के. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta, the 24th March, 1993

INCOME TAX

S.O. 1923.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category “University” subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, ‘Technology Bhawan’, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Gujarat Vidyapith, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380 014, Gujarat.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the

Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 804/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-29/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1924.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर “संस्था” संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, “प्रौद्योगिकी भवन” न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमात्र को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

इंस्टिट्यूट ऑफ इंडियन फौंड्रीमेन, मिडलटन कोर्ट (पहली मंजिल) 4/2 मिडलटन रोड, स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700071

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) “संघ” जैसा प्रवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन कर, अनुमोदन

की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 805/एफ.एस. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/इडलु.बी./9/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए.के. बिस्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1924.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category “Institution” subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, ‘Technology Bhawan’, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Institute of Indian Foundrymen, ‘Middleton Court’ (1st Floor), 4/2, Middleton Street, Calcutta-700 071.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions)

having jurisdiction over the organisations. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 805|F. No. DG|IT(E)|WB-9|35(1)(ii)|90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director,

कलकत्ता, 26 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का आ 1925.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

वस्तु शिल्प फौन्डेशन फार स्टडीज और रिसर्च इन एनविरोन्मेंटल डिजाईन, संगत नालनेज रोड, अहमदाबाद-380054

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-89 से 31-3-91 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम

से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियां में आवेदन करे, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करता है।

[संख्या : 806/एफ सं. म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)/जी.-25/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए.के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1925.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan' New Mahauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Vastu Shilpa Foundation for Studies & Research in Environmental Design, Sangath Thaltej Road, Ahmedabad-380054.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-89 to 31-3-91.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisations.

Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 806/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-25/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का०आ० 1926—गवर्नाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह प्राप्त वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 का धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित (छूट) के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

वस्तु शिल्प फाउंडेशन फार स्टडीज और रिसर्च इन एनवायरनमेंटल डिजाईन, संगत थालतेज रोड, अहमदाबाद-380054।

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-91 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करे, अनुमोदन की

अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र को 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 807 /एफ सं० म०नि०/आ०क० (छूट)/पी-25/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए०के० विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1926.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Vastu Shilpa Foundation for Studies & Research in Environmental Design, Sangath Thaltej Road, Ahmedabad-380054.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-91 to 31-3-94.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisations. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 807/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-25/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A.K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का०आ० 1927.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

सीताराम भाटिया इन्स्टिट्यूट ऑफ साइन्स और रिगर्च, ब्लॉक-1ई, 216, ए०जे०सी० बोस रोड, कलकत्ता-17।

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 808/ए०सं० म०नि०/आ०क (छूट)/प०ब०-38/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए०क० विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1927.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Sitaram Bhatia Institute of Science and Research Block-1E, 216, A. J. Bose Road, Calcutta-17.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisations. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 808/F. No. DG/IT(E)/WB-38/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 26 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का०आ० 1928.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन

विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दार् मई रिक्त कार्यों से सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाव को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

मराठा रिसर्च फाउंडेशन, माने बिल्डिंग, श्री गोविन्द-रावजी मराठे रोड, मिराज-416 410।

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जमा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि व अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतिपों पे आवेदन करे, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करनी हैं।

[संख्या : 809/एफ.० सं० म०/वि०/आ०/क०(छूट)/एम०81/35(1)(ii)/90-91]
ए०क० विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 26th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1928.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the

Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Marathe Research Foundation, Mane Building, Shri Govindraoji Maratha Road, Miraj-416 410, Maharashtra.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 809|F. No. DG|IT(E)|M-81|35(1)(ii)|90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy, Director

कलकत्ता, 29 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1929.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान

विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 भेजेगा, और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा को प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 का धारा 35(1) में द्वा गई रिसर्च कार्यों से संबंधित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

रिसर्च फाउंडेशन फॉर जैनोलॉजी (रजि.), सुगन हाउस, 18, रामानुजा आईयर स्ट्रीट, सी.एस.ई. मद्रास-600079

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 6-6-91 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :

1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संग्रह के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है, के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र को 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करनी हैं।

[म. 810/एफ.सं. म. नि./आ.क. (छूट)/टो.एन./9/35(1)
(iii)/90-91]

ए.के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 29th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1929.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research,

search, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION :

Research Foundation for Jainology (Regd.), Sugan House, 18, Ramanuja Iyer Street, Sowcarpet, Madras-600079.

This Notification is effective for the period from 6-6-90 to 31-3-93.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 810|F. No. DG|IT(E)|TN-9|35(1)(iii)|90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 30 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का.आ. 1930 —सर्वसाधारण को एन.द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन ब्रिहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संग्रह के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

(i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग-अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा;

(ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा; और

(iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा को प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम

1961 की धारा 35(1) में दो गई रिसर्च कार्यों से संबंधित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

डायबेटिक एसोसियेशन ऑफ इंडिया, मनेकजी वाडिया बिल्डिंग,
(रिसर्च एकक), पहली मंजिल, 127, एम.जी. रोड
फोर्ट, बंबई-400061

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी: 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर अध्याय/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता की तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन का अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए गए आवेदन पत्र को 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करता है।

[सं. 811/एफ. सं. भ. नि./आ. क. (छूट)/एम.-56/कल./
35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 30th March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1930.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION:

Dia-betic Association of India, (Research Unit), Menekji Wadia Building, 1st Floor, 127, M. G. Road, Fort, Bombay-400 001.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

NOTES:

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 811/F. No. DG/IT(E)/M-56/Cal/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

का.आ. 1931.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है:—

(1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।

(2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन", न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और

(3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयकर/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दो गई रिसर्च कार्यों से संबंधित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

गुडवाम सेंटर ऑफ आर्टिफिशियल रिसर्च कलकत्ता, पी-3
जादवपुर, विश्वविद्यालय, पो.वा.सं. 17005,
कलकत्ता-700032

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी : 1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (i) "संघ" जैसा (संघर्ग) के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन का मुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है, के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग का प्रस्तुत करनी हैं।

[सं. 812 एफ. सं. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट) व. वं. -18/35
(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1931.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

ADVANCED CENTRE OF CRYOGANIC RE-
SEARCH — CALCUTTA

P.O. Jadavpur University, Post Box No. 17005,
Calcutta-700 032

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

NOTES :

1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.
2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisations. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 812/F. No. DG/IT(E)/WB-18/35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director.

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1932.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संदर्भ के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिस्चर्व क्रिया-कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

मेडिकल रिसर्च सेंटर आफ बंबई अस्पताल ट्रस्ट
12, मार्गर्न लार्ड्स बंबई-400020

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी:—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।"

[संख्या : 813/एफ. सं. म. नि./प्रा. क. (छूट) एम. 1/
35(1)(ii)/90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta the 31st March, 1993

S.O. 1932.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Medical Research Centre of Bombay Hospital Trust,
12, Marine Lines,
Bombay-400 020.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-1992 to 31-3-1993.

1774 GI/94—6

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 813/F. No. DG|IT(E)|M-1|35(1)(ii)|90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. प्रा. 1933.—सर्वे साधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च क्रिया-कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिमाव को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

के. जे. रिसर्च फाउंडेशन,
941, बन्नामलाई हाई रोड,
मद्रास-600034

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी:—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियाँ में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियाँ सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या : 814 एफ. स. म. नि./प्रा. क. (छूट) टी एन.-2/35(1) (ii) /90-91]

ए. के. बिस्वास, उप निदेशक

Calcutta the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1933.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

K. J. Research Foundation
941. Poonamallee High Road,
Madras-600084.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval to the Director General of Income-tax

(Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 814|F. No. DG|IT(E)|TN-2|35(1) (ii)|90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1934—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 को उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियाँ रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च क्रिया-कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय विवरण को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

मैगसं गुरु स्मारक मण्डल,
ई-113 कमला नगर,
आगरा-5

यह अधिवृत्त दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी:—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके

क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अनुमति बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र को 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[म. 315/एफ. स. म. नि. आ. क. (छूट) उ. प्र. 11/35-
(i)(iii)-90-91]

ए. के. बिस्वास, उपा निदेशक

Calcutta the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1934.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, "Technology Bhawan", New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

M/s. Sur Smarak Mandal
E-113, Kamala Nagar
Agra-5.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-94.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 815/F. No. DG|IT(E)|UP-11/35(i)(iii)-90-91]
A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 3 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. प्रा. 1935.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन का, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहिया रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 भेजेगा, और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिसर्च त्रिया कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षा आय-अव्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

एरोनाटिकल डिवलप्मेंट एजेंसी

पी बी. संख्या 1718

बंगलूरु--560017

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-1991 से 31-3-94 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी:—

- (1) उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।
- (2) संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अनुमति बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए गए आवेदन-पत्र

की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करता है।

[संख्या 816/एफ. सं. म. नि.आ.क. (छूट) के टी.-33/कल. 35(1) (ii) 90-91]

ए० के० बिश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1935.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Accounts in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Aeronautical Development Agency,
A. B. No. 1718,
Bangalore-560017.

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-1991 to 31-3-1993.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and will in advance for further extension of the

approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 816|F. No. DG|IT(E)|KT-33|Cal|35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1936.—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए आयकर नियम, के नियम 6 के अधीन बिहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संघ" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :

- (i) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (ii) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली 110016 को भेजगा ; और
- (iii) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर, तक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) (ख) सचिव वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिन के क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दो गई रिसर्च किया जाय सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा परीक्षित आय व्यय हिसाब को प्रस्तुत करेगा

संगठन का नाम

श्री गुजरात इन्सटिट्यूट आफ एरिया प्लानिंग
मुख्य, गांधी नगर हाइवे
नाथ गोटा चार रास्ता अहमदाबाद 382481

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-93 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी:—

1. उपयुक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।
2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है कि माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें। अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 817/एफ.सं.म.नि./आ.क. (छूट)जी.-16/35/(1)
(iii)/90-91]
ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1936.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research 'Technology Bhawan' New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

The Gujarat Institute of Area Planning
Sarkhej-Gandhinagar Highway
My. Sota Ghar Rasta-382481
Ahmedabad

This Notification is effective for the period from 1-4-92 to 31-3-93.

Note : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemption), Calcutta though the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 817/F. No. DG|IT(E)|G-16/35(1)(iii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1937 :—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू महरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली —110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है, और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च क्रिया-कलाप सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

सेंटर फार आर्थ साइंस स्टडीज,
पी. बी. सं. 7250, यशविक्रम पी. आ.
तिरुवन्तापुरम—695031

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-95 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) "संघ" जैसा संवर्ग के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करना है।

[संख्या 818/एफ. सं. म. नि. /आ. क. (छूट) क. 8/35 (1) (ii) / 90-91]

ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1937.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research 'Technology Bhawan' New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Centre for Earth Science Studies,
P. B. No. 7250, Thuvuvikkal P. O.,
Trivandrum-695031.

This Notification is effective for the period from to 1-4-92 to 31-3-95.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 818|F. No. DG|IT(E)|K-8|35(1)(ii)/90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1938 :—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर "संस्था" संवर्ग के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।
- (2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, "प्रौद्योगिकी भवन" न्यू मेहरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली —110016 को भेजेगा, और
- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(1) में दी गई रिमार्क कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब की भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

गुजरात एनर्जी डेवलपमेंट एजेंसी,
बी. एन. चैम्स, तीसरी मंजिल,
आर. सी. दत्त रोड,
बड़ौदा—390005

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-95 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

पणनी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) “संघ” जैसा संघर्ष के लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सुझाव दिया जाता है कि वे अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत करता है।

[संख्या : 819/एफ. सं. म. नि./आ. क. (छूट) जी. 48/35 (1) (ii)/90-91]

ए. के. बिश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1938.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category “Association” subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research ‘Technology Bhawan’ New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year; and
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

Gujarat Energy Development Agency
B. N. Chambers, 3rd Floor,
R. C. Dutt Road,
Vadodara-390005

This Notification is effective for the period from to 1-4-92 to 31-3-95.

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax|Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[No. 819/F. No. DG|IT(E)|G-48|35(1)(ii)|90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

कलकत्ता, 31 मार्च, 1993

आयकर

का. आ. 1939 :—सर्वसाधारण को एतद्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न-उल्लिखित संगठन को, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के लिए, आयकर नियम के नियम 6 के अधीन विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर “संघ” संघर्ष के अधीन अनुमोदित किया गया है :—

- (1) संगठन अनुसंधान कार्यों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियां रखेगा।

- (2) यह अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी कार्यों का एक वार्षिक विवरण प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 मई तक सचिव, वैज्ञानिक व औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग, “प्रौद्योगिकी भवन” न्यू मेहरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली —110016 को भेजेगा, और

- (3) यह प्रत्येक वर्ष के 31 अक्टूबर तक लेखा-परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखा की प्रति (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग और (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) जिनके क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त संगठन पड़ता है और आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 (1) में दी गई रिसर्च कार्यों सम्बन्धित छूट के बारे में लेखा-परीक्षित आय-व्यय हिसाब को भी प्रस्तुत करेगा।

संगठन का नाम

नेशनल इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ डिजाईन
पलडी, अहमदाबाद—380007

यह अधिसूचना दिनांक 1-4-92 से 31-3-95 तक की
अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

टिप्पणी :—1. उपर्युक्त शर्त (1) “संघ” जैसा संवर्ग के
लिए लागू नहीं होगा।

2. संगठन को सूझाव दिया जाता है कि वे
अनुमोदन की अवधि बढ़ाने के लिए आयकर
आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) जिनके
क्षेत्राधिकार में संगठन पड़ता है के माध्यम
से आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट), कलकत्ता को
तीन प्रतियों में आवेदन करें, अनुमोदन
की अवधि बढ़ाने के संबंध में किए आवेदन-
पत्र की 6 प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और
औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को प्रस्तुत
करना है।

[संख्या 820/एफ. सं. म. नि. /आ. क. (छूट) जी 23/
35 (1) (ii) / 90-91]
ए. के. विश्वास, उपनिदेशक

Calcutta, the 31st March, 1993

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1939.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Prescribed Authority under Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 under the category “Institution” subject to the following conditions :

- (i) The organisation will maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) It will furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, ‘Technology Bhawan’, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year by 31st May of each year ; &
- (iii) It will submit to the (a) Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), (b) Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) Commissioner of Income-tax [Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, by the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income and Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961.

NAME OF THE ORGANISATION

National Institute of Design,
Paldi,
Ahmedabad-380 007

This Notification is effective for the period from
1-4-92 to 31-3-95

Notes : 1. Condition (i) above will not apply to
organisations categorised as associations.

2. The organisation is advised to apply in triplicate and well in advance for further extension of the approval, to the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), Calcutta through the Commissioner of Income-tax [Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction over the organisation. Six copies of the application for extension of approval should be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research.

[No. 820/F. No. DG/IT(E)/G-23/35(1)(ii)/
90-91]

A. K. BISWAS, Dy. Director

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 1994

स्टाम्प

का. आ. 1940 :—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा महाराष्ट्र लिमिटेड के शहर और औद्योगिक विकास निगम बम्बई को मात्र पन्चह लाख रुपये का समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क अदा करने की अनुमति देती है, जोकि उक्त निगम द्वारा जारी किए गए मात्र बीस करोड़ रुपये के कुल मूल्य के 1 से 80 तक की विशिष्ट संख्या वाले प्रत्येक अंकित पन्चीस लाख रुपये मूल्य के 80 बंधपत्र प्रमाण पत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क के कारण प्रभावी है।

[सं. -24/92—स्टाम्प का. सं. -33/41/90 बि. क.]

आत्मा राम, अवतर पत्रि

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th July, 1994

STAMPS

S.O. 1940.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits city and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra Limited, Bombay to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupees fifteen lakh only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on 80 Bonds certificates bearing distinctive numbers 1 to 80 of the face value of rupees twenty five lakh each of the aggregate value of rupees twenty crores only issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 24/92-Stamp F. No. 33/41/90-ST]

ATMA RAM, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1941 :—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने जिसमें विदेशी मद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा के अधीन आदेश फा. सं. 673/126/92—सी. शु.—8 दिनांक 4-8-1992 को यह निर्देश जारी किया था कि श्री अमरीक सिंह उर्फ छमकु सुपुत्र श्री तारा सिंह निवासी गांव—हावेलियन जिला—अमृतसर, पंजाब को निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और केन्द्रीय कारागार अमृतसर में अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ताकि उसे भविष्य में तस्करीत माल के परिवहन या छिपाने या रखने का काम करने से अथवा माल की तस्करी का दुष्प्रेरण करने से रोका जा सके।

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या उसे छिपा रखा है जिससे उक्त आदेश का निष्पादन हो सके;

3. अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, यह निर्देश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति इस आदेश के शासकीय राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के 7 दिन के भीतर पुलिस महानिदेशक, पंजाब, चण्डीगढ़ के समक्ष हाजिर हो।

[फा. सं. 673/126/92-सी. शु.-VIII]

रूप चन्द, अवग सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1994

S.O. 1941.-Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specifically empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued under F. No. 673/126/92-Cus. VIII dated 4-8-1992 under the said sub-section directing that Shri Amrik Singh Chamku, S/O Shri Tara Singh R/O Village Havellian Dist. Amritsar, Punjab, be detained and kept in custody in the Central Jail Amritsar with a view to preventing him from dealing in smuggled goods otherwise than by engaging in transporting or canceling or keeping smuggled goods and abetting the smuggling of goods in future;

2. Whereas the Central Government has reasons to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of power conferred by Clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person 1774 GI/94—7

to appear before the Dir. Gen. of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/126/92-Cus. VIII]

ROOP CHAND, Under Secy.

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1942—सामान्य सूचना के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न उल्लिखित संस्था संघ और इसके नीचे दिए गए इसके कार्यक्रम आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 सीसीडी के प्रयोजनार्थ आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 6—ए. ए. सी. के अंतर्गत निर्धारित प्राधिकारी की हैसियत में सचिव पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्रालय भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली द्वारा अनुमोदित किए गए हैं।

संस्था/संघ का नाम

इंडिया-2000 बी-28 प्रेम एनकेव, माकेन नई दिल्ली-110017

कार्यक्रम

दिल्ली में पारिस्थितिकी संतुलन को बनाए रखने के लिए नई दिल्ली के परिसर में 200 एकड़ की बंजर भूमि में वृक्ष लगाना।

(i) धारा 35 सी. सी. बी. की उपधारा (2) के अधीन संस्था संघ और (ii) धारा 35 सी. सी. बी. की उपधारा (1) के अधीन कार्यक्रम को निर्धारित प्राधिकारी द्वारा दिए गए दोनों अनुमोदन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर दिनांक 1-7-1994 से 30-6-1995 तक एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए वैध हैं :—

1. “इंडिया - 2000” नई दिल्ली वृक्ष लगाने तथा पारिस्थितिकी संतुलन को बनाए रखने के लिए इसको प्राप्त दोनों और उपर्युक्त क्षेत्र का एक अलग खाता रखेगा।

2. “इंडिया - 2000” पूरे वर्ष की उपर्युक्त कार्यक्रम की प्रगति रिपोर्ट 31-7-1995 तक निर्धारित प्राधिकारी को प्रस्तुत करेगा।

3. “इंडिया - 2000” पूरे वर्ष के कार्यक्रम की स्थिति को दिखाते हुए कुल आय एवं व्यय तथा तृतीय पत्र को दर्शाते हुए लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों का एक प्रतिनिधि 31-7-95 तक निर्धारित प्राधिकारी को प्रस्तुत करेगा।

4. यह अनुमोदन निर्धारित प्राधिकारी की हमेशा संतुष्टि की शर्त पर दिया गया है और यदि आवश्यक समझा गया तो इसे पूर्व व्याप्ति से वापस लिया जा सकता है।

[अधिसूचना सं. 9568 (फा. सं. 203/18/94-अवग. नि-II)]

अजय कुमार, अवग सचिव

(Central Board of Direct Taxes)

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1994

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 19th July, 1994

S.O. 1942.—It is notified for general information that the Institution/Association mentioned below and its programme given here under, have been approved by the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, New Delhi being the prescribed authority under the rule 6-AAC of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, for the purposes of Section 35CCB of Income-tax Act, 1961.—

NAME OF THE INSTITUTION/ASSOCIATION

India 2000, B-28, Press Enclave, Saket,
New Delhi-110 017.

Programme

Afforestation of 200 acres of wasteland on the outskirts of New Delhi for maintenance of ecological balance in Delhi.

Both the approvals accorded by the Prescribed Authority namely (i) to the Institution/Association under sub-section (2) of Section 35-CCB and (ii) to the programme under sub-section (1) of Section 35CCB are valid for a period of one year with effect from 1-7-1994 to 30-6-1995 subject to the following conditions:—

1. "India 2000", New Delhi shall maintain a separate account of the donations received by it for afforestation and maintenance of ecological balance and the area as mentioned above.
2. "India 2000" shall furnish progress report of the programme mentioned above for the full year to the prescribed authority by the 31 July, 1995.
3. "India 2000" shall submit to the prescribed authority a copy of the audited annual accounts showing the total income and expenditure and balance sheet showing the position of the programme for the full year by 31st July, 1995.
4. The approval is subject to the continued satisfaction of the prescribed authority and may be withdrawn with retrospective effect, if considered necessary.

[Notification No. 9568/F. No. 203/18/94-ITA.II]

AJAY KUMAR, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(वैकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1943 राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक अधिनियम, 1987 (1987 का 53) की धारा 6 के खंड (ख) के उपखंड (i) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के साथ परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, एतद्वारा अध्यक्ष भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को 19 जुलाई 1994 में तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए मुख्य नगर योजनाकार तमिलनाडु सरकार मद्रास के स्थान पर राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक के निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. 7/2/88 - बी. ओ. - 1]

के. के. मंगल, अव्वर सचिव

S.O. 1943.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the National Housing Bank Act, 1987 (53 of 1987), the Central Government, in consultation with Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation of India as a director on the Board of Directors of the National Housing Bank, for a period of three years with effect from 19th July, 1994 in place of Chief Town Planner, Government of Tamilnadu, Madras.

[No. 7/2/88-B.O.I]

K. K. MANGAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1944 राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध तथा प्रकीर्ण उपधि) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 9 के उपखण्ड (2) के साथ पटिन खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री भदेश उदयकांत बैंकर विशेष सहायक इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक, अहमदाबाद गुजरात को दिनांक 22 जुलाई 1994 से 21 जुलाई 1997 तक या जब तक वे इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक के एक कर्मचारी के रूप में अपनी सेवा छोड़ नहीं देते हैं इनमें से जो पहले भी इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक के निदेशक बोर्ड में निदेशक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 15/6/93 - आई. आर.]

एस. के. बत्रा, अव्वर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1994

S.O. 1944.—In pursuance of sub-clause (b) of Clause 3 read with sub-clause (2) of Clause 9 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Bhadesh Udaykant Banker, Special Assistant, Indian Overseas Bank, Ahmedabad, Gujarat as a Director on the Board of Directors of India Overseas Bank with effect from 22nd July, 1994 to 21st July, 1997 or till he ceases to be an employee of the Indian Overseas Bank, whichever is earlier.

[No. 15/6/93-IR]

S. K. BATRA, Under Secy.

(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1994

का.या. 1945--राष्ट्रपति, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 77 के खंड (3) के अनुसरण में, वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन नियम, 1978 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाने हैं, अर्थात्:--

1. (1) इस नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन (तीसरा संशोधन) नियम, 1994 है।
(2) यह राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगा।
2. वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन नियम, 1978 में,
(अ) अनुसूची 5 में,--
(क) सारणी के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित सारणी रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:--

सारणी

प्राधिकारी	शक्ति का विस्तार	
	प्रावर्ती	अनावर्ती
केन्द्रीय सरकार के विभाग		
(i) उप राष्ट्रपति सचिवालय	प्रत्येक दशक में 10,000 रु. प्रति वर्ष	पूरी शक्तियां
(ii) अन्य विभाग	पूरी शक्तियां	पूरी शक्तियां
प्रशासक	पूरी शक्तियां	पूरी शक्तियां
विभागाध्यक्ष	प्रत्येक दशक में 10,000 रु. प्रति वर्ष	प्रत्येक दशक में 40,000 रु.
केन्द्रीय सरकार के विभागों में अवर सचिवों से भिन्न कार्यालय के प्रधान	प्रत्येक दशक में 500 रु. प्रति मास	प्रत्येक दशक में 2,000 रु.
केन्द्रीय सरकार के विभागों के कार्यालय के प्रधान के रूप में घोषित अवर सचिव	प्रत्येक दशक में 1,000 रु. प्रति मास	प्रत्येक दशक में 2,000 रु.

(ख) उपाबंध में,--

- (i) क्रम सं. 9(i) के सामने, स्तम्भ 4 में, खंड (क) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित खंड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:--
(क) उन मामलों में जिनमें किसी उच्च न्यायालय में किसी मामले के लिए 3000 रु. और किसी अन्य न्यायालय में किसी मामले के लिए 1,000 रु. की कुल रकम अंतर्भूत हो;
- (ii) क्रम सं. 14 के सामने स्तम्भ 4 के पैरा 2 में, 25,000, 5,000 और 2,000 अंकों के स्थान पर क्रमशः 50,000, 10,000 और 4,000 अंक रखे जाएंगे;
- (iii) क्रम सं. 26(क) (i) के सामने स्तम्भ 4 के पैरा 2 में, 500 और 5,000 अंकों के स्थान पर क्रमशः 1,000 और 10,000 अंक रखे जाएंगे; और
- (आ) अनुसूची 6 में, सारणी के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित सारणी रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:--

सारणी

प्राधिकारी

वह अधिकतम सीमा जिस तक हर एक अलग-अलग मद पर खर्च मंजूर किया जा सकेगा

आवर्ती

अनावर्ती

केन्द्रीय सरकार के विभाग :

(i) मसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय,
राष्ट्रपति मन्त्रिमण्डल और
उप-राष्ट्रपति मन्त्रिमण्डल

4,000 रु.

पूरी शक्तियां

(ii) अन्य विभाग
प्रशासक :

पूरी शक्तियां

पूरी शक्तियां

(i) लक्षद्वीप के सिवाय सभी मध्य राज्य-
क्षेत्रों के प्रशासक

पूरी शक्तियां

पूरी शक्तियां

(ii) लक्षद्वीप के प्रशासक
विभागाध्यक्ष

4,000 रु. प्रति वर्ष

20,000 रु.

1,000 रु. प्रति वर्ष

10,000 रु.

[फा० सं० 1(i) ई-II (ए)/94]

अनुसूची प्रसाद, अवर सचिव

टिप्पण : वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन नियम, 1978 अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2131, तारीख 22 जुलाई, 1978 द्वारा प्रकाशित किए गए और उसके पश्चात् उनका निम्नलिखित द्वारा संशोधन किया गया :—

- (1) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 1887, तारीख 9-6-1979
- (2) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2942, तारीख 1-9-1979
- (3) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2611, तारीख 4-10-1980
- (4) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2164, तारीख 15-8-1981
- (5) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2304, तारीख 5-9-1981
- (6) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 3073, तारीख 4-9-1982
- (7) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 4171, तारीख 11-12-1982,
- (8) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 1314, तारीख 26-2-1983
- (9) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2502, तारीख 4-8-1984
- (10) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 22, तारीख 5-1-1985
- (11) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 1958, तारीख 11-5-1985
- (12) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 3082, तारीख 6-7-1985
- (13) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 3974, तारीख 24-8-1985
- (14) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 5641, तारीख 21-12-1985
- (15) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 1548, तारीख 19-4-1986
- (16) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 3183, तारीख 20-9-1986
- (17) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 3787, तारीख 8-11-1986
- (18) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 2508, तारीख 19-9-1987
- (19) शुद्धिपत्र सं. का.आ. 3092, तारीख 7-11-1987
- (20) पत्र सं. का.आ. 3581, तारीख 10-12-1988
- (21) पत्र सं. का.आ. 641, तारीख 17-8-1990
- (22) पत्र सं. का.आ. 1469, तारीख 26-5-1990
- (23) पत्र सं. का.आ. 2173, तारीख 18-8-1990
- (24) पत्र सं. का.आ. 3033, तारीख 17-11-1990
- (25) पत्र सं. का.आ. 3414, तारीख 22-12-1990
- (26) पत्र सं. का.आ. 534 तारीख 23-2-1991

- (27) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2235 तारीख 24-8-1991
 (28) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 547 तारीख 24-7-1992
 (29) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 466 तारीख 13-3-1993
 (30) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 1292 तारीख 12-6-1993
 (31) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 685 तारीख 12-3-1994
 (32) अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 1232 तारीख 28-5-1994

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1994

S.O.1945:—In pursuance of clause (3) of Article 77 of the Constitution of India, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1978, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Delegation of Financial Powers (Third Amendment) Rules, 1994.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1978,—
- (A) in Schedule V,—
- (a) for the Table, the following Table shall be substituted, namely :—

“TABLE

Authority	Extent of powers	
	Recurring	Non-recurring
Departments of the Central Government :		
(i) Vice-President's Secretariat.	Rs. 10,000 per annum in each case.	Full powers
(ii) Other Departments.	Full powers.	Full powers
Administrators.	Full powers	Full powers
Heads of Departments.	Rs. 10,000 per annum in each case.	Rs. 40,000 in each case
Heads of Offices other than Under Secretaries in the Departments of Central Govt.	Rs. 500 per month in each case.	Rs. 2,000 in each case.
Under Secretaries in the Departments of the Central Government declared as Heads of Offices.	Rs. 1,000 per month in each case.	Rs. 2,000 in each case.”

(b) in the Annexure,

- (i) against serial number 9 (i) in column 4, for clause (a), the following clause shall be substituted, namely :—
- “(a) in cases involving a total amount of Rs. 3,000 for a case in High Court and Rs. 1,000 for a case in any other court”;
- (ii) against serial number 14 in column 4, in paragraph 2, for the figures “25,000”, “5,000” and “2,000”, the figures “50,000”, “10,000” and “4,000” respectively, shall be substituted;
- (iii) against serial number 26(a)(i), in column 4, in paragraph (2), for the figures “500” and “5,000”, the figures “1,000” and “10,000” respectively, shall be substituted; and

(B) in Schedule VI, for the Table, the following Table shall be substituted, namely :—

“TABLE

Authority	Maximum limit upto which the expenditure may be sanctioned on each individual item	
	Recurring	Non-recurring
Departments of the Central Government :		
(i) Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, President's Secretariat and Vice-President's Secretariat.	Rs. 4,000	Full powers.
(ii) Other Departments.	Full powers.	Full powers.
Administrators :		
(i) Administrators of all the Union Territories except Lakshadweep.	Full Powers.	Full powers.
(ii) Administrator of Lakshadweep.	Rs. 4,000 a year.	Rs. 20,000
Heads of Departments.	Rs. 1,000 a year.	Rs. 10,000"

[No. F. 1(1)-E II(A)/94]

ANURADHA PRASAD, Under Secy.

NOTE : The Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1978 published vide Notification No. S.O. 2131, dated July 22, 1978 have subsequently been amended by :—

(i) Notification	No. S.O. 1887, dated 9-6-1979.
(ii) „	No. S.O. 2942, dated 1-9-1979.
(iii) „	No. S.O. 2611, dated 4-10-1980.
(iv) „	No. S.O. 2164, dated 15-8-1981.
(v) „	No. S.O. 2304, dated 5-9-1981.
(vi) „	No. S.O. 3073, dated 4-9-1982.
(vii) „	No. S.O. 4171, dated 11-12-1982.
(viii) „	No. S.O. 1314, dated 26-2-1983.
(ix) „	No. S.O. 2502, dated 4-8-1984.
(x) „	No. S.O. 22, dated 5-1-1985.
(xi) Corrigendum	No. S.O. 1958, dated 11-5-1985.
(xii) Notification	No. S.O. 3082, dated 6-7-1985.
(xiii) „	No. S.O. 3974, dated 24-8-1985.
(xiv) „	No. S.O. 5641, dated 21-12-1985.
(xv) „	No. S.O. 1548, dated 19-4-1986.
(xvi) „	No. S.O. 3183, dated 20-9-1986.
(xvii) „	No. S.O. 3787, dated 8-11-1986.
(xviii) „	No. S.O. 2508, dated 19-9-1987.
(xix) „	No. S.O. 3092, dated 7-11-1987.
(xx) „	No. S.O. 3581, dated 10-12-1988.
(xxi) „	No. S.O. 641, dated 17-3-1990.
(xxii) „	No. S.O. 1469, dated 26-5-1990.
(xxiii) „	No. S.O. 2173, dated 18-8-1990.
(xxiv) „	No. S.O. 3033, dated 17-11-1990.
(xxv) „	No. S.O. 3414, dated 22-12-1990.
(xxvi) „	No. S.O. 534, dated 23-2-1991.
(xxvii) „	No. S.O. 2235, dated 24-8-1991.
(xxviii) „	No. S.O. 547(E) dated 24-7-1992.
(xxx) „	No. S.O. 466, dated 13-3-1993.
(xxix) „	No. S.O. 1292, dated 12-6-1993.
(xxx) „	No. S.O. 685, dated 12-3-1994.
(xxxii) „	No. S.O. 1232, dated 28-5-1994.

कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1994

का.आ.1946.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि उससे उपावृद्ध अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 20) की (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) धारा 1 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस क्षेत्र में कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है;

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. एस.ई.सी.एल./बी.एस.पी./जी.एम. (पी.एल.जी.)/लैण्ड/132 तारीख 19 अप्रैल, 1994 का निरीक्षण साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि., राजस्व अनुभाग, सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर-495001 के कार्यालय में या कलक्टर गृहडोल (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, कॉमिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाली भूमि में निम्नलिखित सभी व्यक्ति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट सभी तत्वों, चार्टों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से नब्बे दिन के भीतर, भार माध्यक अधिकारी/विभागाध्यक्ष (राजस्व) साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि., सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर-495001 (मध्य प्रदेश) को भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची

आमाशांड ब्लॉक—III

सोहागपुर कोयला क्षेत्र

अधिसूचना—कोयला क्षेत्र

जिला गृहडोल (मध्य प्रदेश)

रेखांक संख्यांक एस.ई.सी.एल./बी.एस.पी./जी.एम./ (पी.एल.जी.)/
लैण्ड/132

तारीख 19 अप्रैल, 1994

(पूर्वेक्षण के लिए अधिसूचित भूमि दर्शाते हुए)

क्रम सं.	ग्राम	पट्टावारी संख्या सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हैक्टर में	टिप्पण
1.	भलवाही	28	कोतमा	गृहडोल	48.000	भाग
2.	वरतराई	24	कोतमा	गृहडोल	135.000	भाग

कुल : 183.000 हैक्टर (लगभग)

या

452.29 एकड़ (लगभग)

सीमा वर्णन :

- क-ख-ग-घ : रेखा ग्राम भलवाही, निमहा, आमाशांड के निराह बिन्दु पर बिन्दु "क" से आरम्भ होती है और ग्राम भलवाही वरतराई की उत्तरी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है।
- घ-ङ : रेखा भागत. ग्राम वरतराई की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "ङ" पर मिलती है।
- ङ-च-छ : रेखा ग्राम वरतराई, भलवाही से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु "छ" पर मिलती है।
- छ-क : रेखा भागत. ग्राम भलवाही की पश्चिमी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और आरम्भिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[स. फा. 43015/10/94-एल.एस. डब्ल्यू.]

बी. बी. राव, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1994

S.O. 1946 :—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the Schedule hereto annexed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein.

The Plan bearing number SECL/BSP/GM/(PLG)/Land/132 dated the 19th April, 1994 of the area covered by this notification can be inspected in the office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Revenue Section, Seepat Road, Bilaspur-495001 or in the office of the Collector, Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1 Council House Street, Calcutta.

All persons interested in the land covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Officer-in-Charge/Head of the Department (Revenue), South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Bilaspur-495001 (Madhya Pradesh) within ninety days from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

AMADAND BLOCK III

SOHAGPUR COALFIELDS

JAMUNA-KOTMA AREA

DISTRICT : SHAHDOL (MADHYA PRADESH)

Plan number SECL/BSP/GM(PLG)/Land/132

Dated 19th April, 1994.

(Showing land notified for prospecting)

Sl. No.	Village	Patwari Halka Number	Tahsil	District	Area in Hectares	Remarks
1.	Bhalwahi	28	Kotma	Shahdol	48.000	Part
2.	Bartarai	24	Kotma	Shahdol	135.000	Part
Total :					183.000 hectares (approximately) or 452.19 acres (approximately)	

Boundary description :—

A—B—C—D

Line starts from point 'A' on the trijunction point of villages Bhalwahi, Nimha, Amadand and passes along the northern boundary of villages Bhalwahi, Bartarai and meets at point 'D'.

D—E

Line passes partly along the eastern boundary of village Bartarai and meets at point 'E'.

E—F—G

Line passes through villages Bartarai, Bhalwahi and meets at point 'G'.

G—A

Line passes partly along the western boundary of village Bhalwahi and meets at the starting point 'A'.

[No. F. 43015/10/94/LSW]
B.B. RAO, Dy. Secy.

सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय और

सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 4 जुलाई, 1994

का.प्र. 1947.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो निम्न, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड "ख" के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे दिए गए मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया है/किये गये हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम संशोधित भारतीय मानक की संख्या	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तारीख
संख्या और वर्ष		
1	2	3
1. आईएस : 398(भाग 2) : 1976	संशोधन सं. 4, फरवरी, 1993	1993-02-28
2. आईएस 8448 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1, मई, 1994	1994-05-31
3. आईएस 8448 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 2, जुलाई, 1994	1994-07-31

इन संशोधन की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों बम्बई, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़ तथा मद्रास और शाखा कार्यालयों ग्रहमवाबाद, धंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जबपुर, कानपुर, पटना और त्रिवेन्द्रम, गाजियाबाद तथा फरीदाबाद में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संख्या के.प्र.वि/13 : 5]

एन. श्रीनिवासन, अपर महानिदेशक

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES
Consumer Affairs & Public Distribution
Bureau of Indian Standards
New Delhi, the 4th July, 1994

S.O. 1947.—In pursuance of clause(b) of Sub-Rule (1) of Rule 7 of Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendment (s) to the Indian Standard (s) given in the schedule hereto annexed has/have been issued.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and year of the Indian Standard amended	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
1	2	3	4
1.	IS : 398(Part 2) : 1976	Amendment No. 4, Feb., 1993	1993-02-28
2.	IS 8448 : 1989	Amendment No. 1, May, 1994	1994-05-31
3.	IS 8448 : 1989	Amendment No. 2, July, 1994	1994-07-31

Copies of these amendments are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Office : Bombay, Calcutta, Chandigarh and Madras and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneshwar, Coimbatore Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Patna and Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13 : 5]

N. SRINIVASAN, Addl. Director General

खाद्य और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग)

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 05 जुलाई, 1994

का.आ. 1948.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के नियम (1) की खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस/जिन भारतीय मानक/मानकों का/के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है/दिए गए हैं वह/वे स्थापित हो गया है/हो गए हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम	स्थापित भारतीय मानक को की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	नव भारतीय मानक द्वारा प्रति- क्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
1	2	3	4
1.	आई एस : 27-1992 कच्चा सीसा—विशिष्ट (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 27-1977	1992-08-31
2.	आई एस 876-1992 शिरोपरि प्रेषण और दूरसंचार हेतु लकड़ी के लट्टे—विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 876-1970	1992-08-31
3.	आई एस : 1654-1992 सीसा एन्टोमनी मिश्रधातु—विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 1654-1978	1992-08-31
4.	आई एस : 2974 (भाग 3)—1992 मशीन फाउन्डेशन का डिजाइन और निर्माण रीतिसंहिता भाग 3 धूर्णी टाइप मशीनों हेतु फाउन्डेशन (मध्यम और उच्च श्रृंखला) (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 2974 (भाग 3)— 1975	1992-08-31
5.	आई एस : 2994-1992 बिजली के स्टोव—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 2994-1986	1992-08-31
6.	आई एस : 3025 (भाग 4)—1992 पानी और गंदे जल के नमूने लेने और परीक्षण (भौतिक और रासायनिक) विधियां भाग-4 केडमियम (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3025 (भाग 4)— 1964	1992-09-30
7.	आई एस : 3025 (भाग-42)—1992 पानी और गंदे जल के नमूने लेने और परीक्षण (भौतिक और रासायनिक) विधियां भाग 42 तांबा (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3025 (भाग-42)— 1964	1992-08-31
8.	आई एस : 3115-1992 खूना आधारित ब्लाक—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3115-1978	1992-09-30
9.	आई एस : 3156 (भाग 1)—1992 घोस्टा ट्रांसफार्मर—विशिष्ट भाग-1 सामान्य प्रयोग (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3156 (भाग)-1	1992-07-31
10.	आई एस : 3200 (भाग 8)—1992 कार्बोलाईट का रासायनिक विश्लेषण भाग-8 फास्फोरस पेन्टाक्साइड और सिलिका का निर्धारण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3200 (भाग 8)— 1965	1992-08-31
11.	आई एस : 3520-1992 जल विलेय सोडियम कार्बोक्सीमिथाइल सेल्युलोज—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3520-1979	1991-08-31
12.	आई एस : 3630-1992 गैर भाखाही जिप्सम के ब्लाक विभाजकों का निर्माण रीति संहिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3630-1966	1992-09-30

1	2	3	4
13.	आई एस : 3885 (भाग 1)—1992 परतदार कमानी (रेल के डिब्बे) के उत्पादन हेतु इस्पात भाग-1 लेट मेकान-विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3885 (भाग 1)—1977	1992-08-31
14.	आई एस : 4282—1992 शल्य क्रिया यंत्र-प्लास्टिक शल्यक्रिया हेतु विच्छेदन चिमटी—आकार और आयाम	आई एस : 4282—1967	1992-09-30
15.	आई एस : 4495—1992 मिनेमोटोप्राफी कम ग्रेज के फिल्म प्रोजेक्टर का प्रकाश आउटपुट-मापन विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 4495—1968	1992-09-30
16.	आई एस : 4622—1992 जड़ित पहल वाले गैट संरचना डिजाइन-सिफारिशें (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 4622—1978	1992-08-31
17.	आई एस : 6175 (भाग 7)—1992 चूड़ी कसे जाने वाली टोंटियां भाग 7—आर पी श्रेणियों के समाप्तर पाइप चूड़ियां—विशिष्ट	आई एस : 6172—1979	1992-08-31
18.	आई एस : 6566—1992 श्रेणी 1 मालवाही आधान-वर्गीकरण, आयाम और रेटिंग (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 6566—1988	1992-07-31
19.	आई एस : 7461 (भाग 3)—1992 टेपर्ड रोलर बेयरिंग हेतु सीमा आयाम की सामान्य आयोजना भाग 3 फ्लैज्ड कप (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 7461—1988	1992-09-30
20.	आई एस : 7561—1992 शल्य क्रिया यंत्र-पित्तशय की पथरी हेतु चिमटी—ड्रेसिंग डिजाइन रेटिंग—आकार और आयाम (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 7561—1975	1992-08-31
21.	आई एस : 9688—1992 नेत्र शल्य क्रिया यंत्र—हुक स्ट्रेविस्मस—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 9688—1988	1992-08-31
22.	आई एस : 11419—1992 सूचना अन्तरपरिवर्तन हेतु चम्बकीय टेप की फाइल संरचना और लेबल अंकन (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 11419—1985	1992-05-31
23.	आई एस : 12308 (भाग 13)—1992 ढाँचे और कच्चे लोहे के गामायनिक विश्लेषण की विधियां भाग-13 परमाणु अवशोषण स्पेक्ट्रो फोटोमितीय विधि द्वारा मैग्नीशियम (0.1 प्रतिशत तक मैग्नीशियम)	आई एस :	1992-09-30
24.	आई एस : 13275—1992 क्षेत्र संतुलन उपस्कर—विवरण और मूल्यांकन	—	1992-07-31
25.	आई एस : 13288 (भाग-3)—1992 श्रेणी मालवाही आधान—विशिष्ट और आधान भाग 3 द्रव और गैसों हेतु टैंक आधान	आई एस : 7037 (भाग 1 और 2)—1973	1992-08-31
26.	आई एस : 13390—1992 सड़क वाहन सामने जड़ित बेरियर संघर्ष परीक्षण विधि	—	1992-06-30
27.	आई एस : 13410—1992 कांच प्रबलित पालीएस्टर शीट संघर्ष योगिक (एस एम सी)—विशिष्ट	—	1992-09-30
28.	आई एस : 13417—1992 इस्पात का उष्मा उपचार की रीति संहिता	—	1992-08-31
29.	आई एस : 13431—1992 जलपोत निर्माण स्तेहन तेल प्रणाली डिजाइन, संविरचना, संस्थापन और परीक्षण—रीतिसंहिता	—	1992-08-31
30.	आई एस : 13448—1992 मौसम विज्ञान-थर्मोइलेक्ट्रिक पावर हैलियोमीटर—विशिष्ट	—	—
31.	आई एस : 13449—1992 खाद्य सामग्री औषध, पेयजल के संपर्क में आने वाले इथाइलीन विनाइलएसिटेट के संबटकों की अनुमत सूची	—	1992-08-31

1	2	3	4
32.	आई एस : 13452 (भाग 4)—1992 फ़ैरोकोमियम का रासायनिक विश्लेषण भाग 4 अल्प कार्बन और उच्च कार्बन फ़ैरोकोमियम का प्रत्यक्ष दहन विधि द्वारा निष्पत्ति	—	1992-08-31
33.	आई एस : 13459—1992 एनगस्ट्रोम पाइरहेलिओमीटर—विशिष्ट संचकन और एक्सट्रजन हेतु	—	1992-08-31
34.	आई एस : 13463—1992 संचकन और एक्सट्रजन हेतु पॉलीएमीड (नाइलॉन-6) सामग्री—विशिष्ट	—	1992-09-30
35.	आई एस : 13473 (भाग-2)—1992 क्रेन—शब्दावली भाग-2 क्रेन	—	1992-07-31
36.	आई एस : 13474—1992 लवण जल में डिब्रिबन्ड हरी मिर्च—विशिष्ट	—	1992-08-31
37.	आई एस : 13476—1992 मोटर वाहन—यांत्रिक स्टीयरिंग गियर—परीक्षण विधि	—	1992-08-31
38.	आई एस : 13478—1992 कृषि परिवहन उपस्कर—कांच रेखा प्रबलित असंतृप्त पॉलीएस्टर (जी आर पी) रेजिन की बुग्गी—विशिष्ट	—	1992-08-31
39.	आई एस : 13586—1992 मोटर वाहन आर्टीकुलेशन की परीक्षण विधि	—	1992-08-31
40.	आई एस : 13508—1992 मशीन वेप्टन हेतु कुंडली और सरिए के स्पर्श कोण में कमी मापन की परीक्षण प्रक्रिया	—	1992-09-30
41.	आई एस : 13509—1992 मोटर वाहन—टोइंग वाहन—रियर क्रसमैम्बर पर बिजली कनेक्शन का माउंटिंग	—	1992-08-31
42.	आई एस : 13515—1992 अंग कनवर्सेंस—विशिष्ट	—	1992-09-30
43.	आई एस : 13517—1992 शीस काबले—रेजिन टाइप—विशिष्ट	—	1992-09-30

इन मानकों/संशोधनों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक भूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों बम्बई, कलकत्ता, चंडीगढ़ तथा मद्रास और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, मुंबई, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, पटना और त्रिवेन्द्रम, गाजियाबाद तथा फरीदाबाद में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध है।

[सं. के.प्रवि/13: 2]
एन. श्रीनिवासन अपर महानिदेशक

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES
(Department of Civil Supplies)

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS
New Delhi, the 5th July, 1994

S.O.1948.—In pursuance of clause(b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987. The Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), Particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been established on the date indicated against each :

The Schedule

Sl. No.	No., Year and Title of the Indian Standard(s) Established	No. and year of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Date of Establishment
1	2	3	4
1.	IS 27 : 1992 Pig lead—Specification (Fourth Revision)	IS 27 : 1977	1992-08-31

1	2	3	4
2.	IS 876 : 1992 Wood poles for overhead power and telecommunication lines—Specification (Third Revision)	IS 876 : 1970	1992-08-31
3.	IS 1654 : 1992 Lead-antimony alloys—Specification (Third Revision)	IS 1654 : 1978	1992-08-31
4.	IS 2974 (Part 3) : 1992 Design and construction of machine foundations—Code of practice Part 3 Foundations for rotary type machines (Medium and high frequency) (Second Revision)	IS 2974 (Part 3) : 1975	1992-08-31
5.	IS 2994 : 1992 Electric stoves—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 2994 : 1986	1992-08-31
6.	IS 3025 (Part 41) : 1992 Methods of sampling and test (Physical and chemical) for water and wastewater Part 41 Cadmium (First Revision)	IS 3025 (Part 41) : 1964	1992-09-30
7.	IS 3025 (Part 42) : 1992 Methods of sampling and test (Physical and chemical) for water and wastewater Part 42 Copper (First Revision)	IS 3025 (Part 42) : 1964	1992-08-31
8.	IS 3115 : 1992 Lime based Block—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 3115 : 1978	1992-09-30
9.	IS 3156 (Part 1) : 1992 Voltage transformers Specification Part 1 General requirements (Second Revision)	IS 3156 (Part 1) : 1978	1992-07-31
10.	IS 3200 (Part 8) : 1992 Chemical analysis of cryolite Part 8 Determination of phosphorus pentoxide and silica (First Revision)	IS 3200 (Part 8) : 1965	1992-08-31
11.	IS 3520 : 1992 Water-soluble sodium carboxymethyl cellulose—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 3520 : 1979	1992-08-31
12.	IS 3630 : 1992 Construction of non-load bearing gypsum block partitions—Code of practice (First Revision)	IS 3630 : 1966	1992-09-30
13.	IS 3885 (Part 1) : 1992 Steel for the manufacture of laminated springs (Railway rolling stock) Part 1 Flat sections—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 3885 (Part) : 1977	1992-08-31

1	2	3	4
14.	IS 4282 : 1992 Surgical instruments— Dessecting forceps, plastic surgery-shapes and dimensions (First Revision)	IS 4282 : 1967	1992-09-30
15.	IS 4495 : 1992 Cinematography light output of narrow gauge film projectors—Method of measurement (First Revision)	IS 4495 : 1968	1992-09-30
16.	IS 4622 : 1992 Fixed-wheel gates structural design—Recommendations (Second Revision)	IS 4622 : 1978	1992-08-31
17.	IS 6175 (Part 7) : 1992 Screwing taps Part 7 Screwing taps for pipe threads parallel Rp series—Specification	IS 6172 : 1979 (Superseding IS 6172)	1992-03-31
18.	IS 6566 : 1992 Series 1 freight containers— Classification, dimensions and ratings (Second revision)	IS 6566 : 1988	1992-07-31
19.	IS 7461 (Part 3) : 1992 General plan of boundary dimensions for tapered roller bearings Part 3 Flanged cups (Second Revision)	IS 7461 : 1980	1992-09-30
20.	IS 7561 : 1992 Surgical instruments—forceps, gallatone, desjardins pattern—Shape and dimensions (First Revision)	IS 7561 : 1975	1992-08-31
21.	IS 9688 : 1992 Eye surgery instruments, Hooks, Strabismus—Specification (First Revision)	IS 9688 : 1980	1992-08-31
22.	IS 11419 : 1992 File structure and labelling of magnetic tapes for information interchange (First Revision)	IS 1419 : 1985	1992-05-31
23.	IS 12308 (Part 13) : 1992 Methods of chemical analysis of cast iron and Pig Iron Part 13 Determination of magnesium by atomic absorption spectrometric methods (for magnesium up to 0.1 percent)	—	1992-09-30
24.	IS 13275 : 1992 Field balancing equipment Description and evaluation	—	1992-07-31
25.	IS 13288 (Part 3) : 1992 Series 1 freight container Specification and testing Part 3 Tank containers for liquid and gases.	IS 7037 (Part 1 & 2) : 1973 [Superseding IS 7037 (Parts 1/2) 1973]	1992-08-31
26.	IS 13390 : 1992 Road vehicles—frontal fixed barrier collision test method	—	1992-06-30
27.	IS : 13410 : 1992 Glass reinforced polyester sheet moulding compounds (SMC) Specification	—	1992-09-30
28.	IS 13417 : 1992 Code of practice for heat treatment of steel	—	1992-08-31
29.	IS 13431 : 1992 Shipbuilding—design, fabrication, installation and testing of ships' lubricating oil system—Code of practice	—	1992-08-31

1	2	3	4
30.	IS 13448 : 1992 Meteorology-Thermoelectric pyrheliometer-Specification	—	1992-08-31
31.	IS 13449 : 1992 Positive list of constituents of ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA) copolymers in contact with foodstuffs, pharmaceuticals and drinking water	—	1992-08-31
32.	IS 13452 (Part 4) : 1992 Chemical analysis of ferrochromium Part 4 Determination of total sulphur in low carbon and high carbon ferrochromium by direct combustion method.	—	1992-08-31
33.	IS 13459 : 1992 Angstrom pyrheliometer Specification	—	1992-08-31
34.	IS 13463 : 1992 Polyamide (Nylon 6) materials for moulding and extrusion—Specification	—	1992-09-30
35.	IS 13473 (Part 2) : 1992 Cranes : Vocabulary Part 2 Mobile cranes	—	1992-07-31
36.	IS 13474 : 1992 Green papper canned in brine—Specification	—	1992-08-31
37.	IS 13476 : 1992 Automotive vehicles—Mechanical steering gear—Methods of test	—	1992-08-31
38.	IS 13478 : 1992 Farm transport equipment—Glass fibre reinforced unsaturated polyester (GRP) resin animal drawn vehicles body—Specification	—	1992-08-31
39.	IS 13506 : 1992 Automotive vehicles—Method of test for articulation	—	1992-08-31
40.	IS 13508 : 1992 Test procedure for measurement of loss tangent angle of coils and bars for machine winding—Guide	—	1992-09-30
41.	IS 13509 : 1992 Automotive vehicles—Towing vehicles—mounting of electrical connections on rear cross members	—	1992-08-31
42.	IS 13515 : 1992 Rust converters—Specification	—	1992-09-30
43.	IS 13517 : 1992 Rock bolts-Resin type—Specification.	—	1992-09-30

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhawan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : Bombay, Calcutta, Chandigarh, and Madras and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Patna and Trivandrum.

[No. CMD/13 : 2]

N. SRINIVASAN, Addl. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 1994

का.आ. 1949.—भारतीय मानक व्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) की खंड (ब) के अनुसरण में ही भारतीय मानक व्यूरो एलएड द्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस/जिन भारतीय मानक/मानकों, का/के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है/दिए गए हैं, वह/वे स्थापित हो गया है/हो गए हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक (को) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक द्वारा प्रति- रूपित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों यदि कोई हों, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
1	2	3	4
1.	आई एस : 302-2-35-1993 घरेलू और ऐसे ही बिजली के साधनों की निरापेक्षता भाग 2 विशिष्ट अपेक्षाएं खंड 35 सतत पानी गर्म करने के बिजली के हीटर	आई एस : 302-1979	1993-02-28
2.	आई एस : 625-1993 बाइसिकल हैंडल-विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 625-1963	1993-02-28
3.	आई एस : 802 (भाग 1/खंड 2)-1992 शिरोपरि प्रेषण लाइनों में संरचना इस्पात का प्रयोग-रीति संहिता भाग 1 सामग्री, भार और अनुमत्य विकृति खंड 2 अनुमत्य विकृति	आई एस : 802 (भाग 1)-1977	1992-12-31
4.	आई एस : 1359-1992 रंगों की विद्युत लेप-विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 1359-1977	1992-12-31
5.	आई एस : 1478-1992 मिट्टी की कक्षा पर बिछाने की टाइलें-विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 1478-1969	1992-02-31
6.	आई एस : 1571-1992 उड्डयन टर्बाइन ईंधन, कार्बोसिन टाइप-विशिष्ट (छठा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 1478-1969	1992-12-31
7.	आई एस : 1885 (भाग 9)-1992 विद्युत तकनीकी सन्दावली भाग 9 विद्युत रिले	आई एस : 1885 (भाग 9)- 1986	1992-12-31
8.	आई एस : 2600 (भाग 4)-1993 ड्राई की डलाई हेतु जिक और जिक आधारित मिश्रधातु की रासायनिक विश्लेषण की विधियां भाग 4 स्पेक्ट्रोफोटोमीटर द्वारा क्रोमियम का निश्चरण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 2600-1964	1993-02-28
9.	आई एस : 2690 (भाग 1)-1993 पकी मिट्टी की फ्लैट टैरेसिंग टाइल-विशिष्ट भाग 1 मशीन से बनी	आई एस : 2690 (भाग 1)- 1975	1993-01-31
10.	आई एस : 3008-1993 जूते पर ब्लैकिंग के लिए ब्रूश-विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3008-1978	1993-03-31
11.	आई एस : 3009-1993 जूते पालिश करने के लिए ब्रूश-विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3009-1971	1993-02-28
12.	आई एस : 3025 (भाग 44)-1993 जल और गंदे जल के नमूने लेने और (भौतिक और रासायनिक) परीक्षण की विधियां भाग 44 जल-रासायनिक ऑक्सीजन मांग (बी ओ डी) (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3025-1964	1993-03-31
13.	आई एस : 3367-1993 सिंघाई और जल निकाम कार्यों के लिए प्रयुक्त पकी मिट्टी की टाइलें-विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3367-1975	1993-02-28

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14. आई एस : 3978-1993 पक्की मिट्टी की बंगलोर पैटर्न की छत पर बिछाने की टाइल-रीनि संहिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 3978-1967	1993-02-28	
15. आई एस : 4044-1993 वस्त्रादि-पुरुषों का खड़ा स्वेटर बुना (निटेड) विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 4044-1967	1993-02-28	
16. आई एस : 4290 (भाग 1)-1992 खुदरापन तुलना नमने भाग 1 टर्नड, धिमा बोर किया पिसा, आकार दिया, समतल किया (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 4290-1968	1992-10-31	
17. आई एस : 4478-1992 जलपोत निर्माण डेरिक रिंग-शब्दावली	आई एस : 4478-1968	1992-12-31	
18. आई एस : 4873-1993 फफूंदी से लकड़ी परिरक्षियों की प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 4873-1968	1993-02-28	
19. आई एस : 5235-1992 मौसम विज्ञान-रिकार्डिंग हेतु वर्षामार्पा-विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 5235-1969	1992-12-31	
20. आई एस : 5644 (भाग 1)-1993 धात्विक चूर्ण-अपचयन विधि द्वारा आक्सीजन अंश का निर्धारण भाग 1 सामान्य मार्गदर्शिका (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 5644-1985	1993-02-28	
21. आई एस : 5966-1993 सामान्य प्रयोजनों हेतु परिवर्तित रूप में गैर कोनीफर इमारती लकड़ी-विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 5966-1970	1993-02-28	
22. आई एस : 6550-1992 समान्तर शीक सहित चूड़ी मिलिंग कटर-विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 6550-1971	1992-12-31	
23. आई एस : 6551-1992 मार्स जंक सहित चूड़ी मिलिंग कटर-विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 6551-1971	1992-12-31	
24. आई एस : 6644-1992 तले और एंडियों हेतु खड़ की माइक्रो सेल्युलर जीट-विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 6644-1972	1992-12-31	
25. आई एस : 6849 (भाग 2)-1993 घनात्मक विस्थापन निर्वात पंप-कार्यकारित, अभिलक्षणों का मापन भाग 2 चरमदाब का मापन (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 6849 (भाग 2)-1973	1993-01-31	
26. आई एस : 7296-1992 बुडवक्रिय सतह समतलन और मोटा करने वाली मशीन हेतु परीक्षण चार्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 7296-1974	1992-12-31	
27. आई एस : 7635-1992 2-नाइट्रोएनिलीन-विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 7635-1975	1992-12-31	
28. आई एस : 7636-1992 4-क्लोरो 2 टॉलूडीन-विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 7636-1975	1992-12-31	
29. आई एस : 7806-1993 उन्नतता संश्लेषण सेवाओं हेतु ऑस्टेनाइट मिश्रधातु और मार्टेनलाइट इस्पात-विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 7806-1985	1993-01-31	
30. आई एस : 8092-1992 वायु फिटिंग और अन्य पाइपिंग घटकों की सतह गुणता निरीक्षण की संहिता (दृश्य विधि) (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 8092-1976	1992-11-30	
31. आई एस : 9419-1993 पुनर्र लेग विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 9419-1980	1993-02-28	
32. आई एस : 9654-1993 ट्रांसफार्मर और प्रेस्क क्रोड के उत्पादकों द्वारा पति का जाने वाला फेराइट सामग्री पर सूचना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस : 9654-1980	1993-02-28	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
33.	आईएस : 9944--1992 प्राकृतिक और कृत्रिम रेशे से बनी रस्सी स्लिंग--सुरक्षित कार्यकारी भार पर सिफारिशें (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस : 9949-1981	1992-10-31
34.	आईएस : 10502-1993 स्वार गम, खाद्य ग्रेड--विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस : 10502-1985	1993-02-28
35.	आईएस : 11611-1992 बाल्य हेतु अग्नि परीक्षण (मृदु सीटेड चौथाई मुडान वाला बाल्य सहित)--परीक्षण विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस : 11611--1986	1992-12-31
36.	आईएस : 12970 (भाग 2/खंड 3)--1993 अर्द्ध चालक युक्तियां--एकीकृत परिपथ भाग 2 डिजिटल एकीकृत परिपथ आवश्यक रेटिंग और अभिलक्षण खंड 3 एकीकृत परिपथ माइक्रो प्रोसेसर	आईएस : 7441 (भाग 1) 1974	1993-02-28
37.	आईएस : 12970 (भाग 3/खंड 2)--1992 अर्द्धचालक युक्तियां एकीकृत परिपथ भाग 3 डिजिटल एकीकृत परिपथ मापन विधियां खंड 2 स्थैतिक अभिलक्षण	आईएस : 7441 (भाग 1) 1974	1992-12-31
38.	आईएस : 12970 (भाग 5/खंड 3)--1992 अर्द्धचालक युक्तियां एकीकृत परिपथ भाग 5 एनालॉग एकीकृत परिपथ--आवश्यक रेटिंग और अभिलक्षण खंड 3 श्रव्य प्रवर्द्धक वीडियो प्रवर्द्धक और बहुचैनल प्रवर्द्धक दूरसंचार प्रयोजनों हेतु	आईएस : 7441 (भाग 1) 1974	1992-12-31
39.	आईएस : 13252-1992 विद्युतीय व्यापारिक उपकरणों सहित सूचना तकनीकी की सुरक्षा	--	1992-10-31
40.	आईएस : 13381-1992 पोटेशियम कार्बोनेट निर्जल और सेमकवी हाइड्रेट फोटोग्राफीय ग्रेड विशिष्ट	--	1992-11-30
41.	आईएस : 13466-1992 विद्युत मशीनों हेतु ब्रुश--विशिष्ट	--	1992-12-31
42.	आईएस : 13525--1992 कार्बन ब्रुश हेतु नम्य चालक--विशिष्ट	--	1992-12-31
43.	आईएस : 13540 (भाग 1)--1992 आग्नेय अस्त्र और असला--4.5 मिमी (.177) की एयर राइफल और एयर पिस्टल पैनल भाग 1 सामान्य प्रयोजन	--	1992-12-31
44.	आईएस : 13557 (भाग 14)-1993 सूचना प्रक्रम तंत्र शब्दावली भाग 14 विश्वसनीय रख-रखाव और उपलब्धता	--	1993-01-31
45.	आईएस : 13590-1992 एसी एसीट 2--एनीमिडाइड--विशिष्ट	--	1992-12-31
46.	आईएस : 13595-1992 वायुयानों हेतु सिलवर आक्साइड जिंक बैटरीज--विशिष्ट	--	1992-12-31
47.	आईएस : 13596--1993 पिसाई पाटों पर आयातीय छूटें	--	1993-01-31
48.	आईएस : 13606-1993 चमड़े प्रक्रमण हेतु संश्लिष्ट सल्फो क्लोरो-नेटिव बमालिकर विशिष्ट	--	1993-01-31
49.	आईएस : 13607--1992 सामान्य प्रयोजी संश्लिष्ट फिनिशिंग हेतु तैयारशुदा रोगन --विशिष्ट	--	1992-12-31
50.	आईएस : 13617-1992 वायुचालित फिल्टरों के ताब पात और प्रवाह अभिरक्षण के बीच मूल्यांकन--परीक्षण विधि	--	1992-12-31
51.	आईएस : 13622--1993 गेट हाइस्ट के पम्प की कसौटी	--	1993-02-28

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
52.	आईएस : 13626-1993 बस्त्रादि रंजक सामग्री—विस्तारित वर्णक का विमरणीयता	—	1993-02-28
53.	आईएस : 13642-1992 कृषि कीट नाशो मैटालैक्सल डब्ल्यूएस—विशिष्ट	—	1993-12-31
54.	आईएस : 13647-1993 इंजीनियरी हेतु रोडियम बिद्युत लेप—विशिष्ट	—	1993-02-28

इन मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों बम्बई, कलकत्ता, चंडीगढ़ तथा मद्रास और शाखा कार्यालयों, अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, गुवाहाटी, इरावादा, जयपुर, कानपुर, पटना और त्रिवेंद्रम, गाजियाबाद तथा फरीदाबाद के बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. के प्रवि / 13 : 2]
एन. श्रीनिवासन, अपर महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 5th July, 1994

S.O. 1949.— In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been established on the date indicated against each :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. year and Title of the Indian Standard(s) established	No. and year of the Indian standards if any, superseded by the new Indian standard.	Date of establishment
1	2	3	4
1.	IS:302-2-35 (1993) Safty of household and similar electrical appliances Part 2 Particular Requirements Section 35 electric instentaneous water heaters	IS:302:1979	1993-02-28
2.	IS 625-1993 Bicycle handle bars—specification (Second Revision)	IS:625:1963	1993-02-28
3.	IS:802-(Part 1/Sec 2): 1992 Use of structural steel in overhead transmission line towers—Code of practice Part 1 Material, loads and permissible stresses section 2 Permissible stresses (Third Revision)	IS:802 (Part 1): 1977	1992-12-31
4.	IS 1359-1992 Electroplated coating of tin— specification (Third Revision)	IS 1359-1977	1992-12-31
5.	IS:1478-1992 Clay flooring tiles—specification (Second Revision)	IS:1478-1969	1992-02-31
6.	IS:1571-1992- Aviation turbine fuels, kerosine type—Specification (Sixth Revision)	IS:1468-1969	1992-12-31

1	2	3	4
7.	IS 1885 (Part 9) : 1992 Electrotechnical vocabulary Part 9 Electrical relays (Second Revision)	IS 1885 (Part 9) 1986	1992-12-31
8.	IS : 2600 (Part 4): 1993 Methods of chemical analysis of zinc and zinc base alloys for die castings Part 4 Determination of chromium by spectrophotometric method (First Revision)	IS 2600:1964	1993-02-28
9.	2690 (Part 1):1993 Burnt clay flat terracing tiles—Specification Part 1 Machine made. (Second Revision)	IS 2690(Part 1) 1975	1993-01-31
10.	IS 3008-1993 Brush, shoe blacking—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 3008:1978	1993-03-31
11.	IS 3009 : 1993 Brushes, shoe polishing—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 3009:1971	1993-02-28
12.	IS 3025 (Part 44):1993 Methods of sampling and test (Physical and chemical) for water and waste water Part 44 Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) (First Revision)	IS 3025:1964	1993-03-31
13.	IS 3367 : 1993 Burnt clay tiles for use in lining irrigation and drainage works—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 3367:1975	1993-02-28
14.	IS 3978 : 1993 Manufacture of burnt clay mangalore pattern roofing tiles—Code of practice. (First Revision)	IS 3978:1967	1993-02-28
15.	IS 4044 : 1993 Textiles—Gents' slipover, knitted—Specification (First Revision)	IS 4044:1967	1993-02-28
16.	IS 4290 (Part 1):1992 Roughness comparison specimens Part 1 Turned, ground, bored, milled, shaped and planed. (First Revision)	IS 4290:1968	1992-10-31
17.	IS 4478 : 1992 Shipbuilding—derrick rigs—Glossary of terms (First Revision)	IS 4478:1968	1992-12-31
18.	IS 4873:1993 Method of laboratory testing of wood preserva- tives against fungi (First Revision)	IS 4873:1968	1993-02-28
19.	IS 5235:1992 Meteorology—raingauges recording—Specification (First Revision)	IS 5235:1969	1992-12-31
20.	IS 5644 (Part 1):1993 Metallic powders-Determination of oxygen content by reduction methods Part 1 General guidelines (Third Revision)	IS 5644:1985	1993-02-28
21.	IS 5966:1993 Non-coniferous timber in converted form for general purposes—Specification (First Revision)	IS 5966:1970	1993-02-28
22.	IS 6550:1992 Thread milling cutter with parallel shank—Specifica- tion (First Revision)	IS 6550:1971	1992-12-31
23.	IS 6551 : 1992 Thread milling cutters with morse taper shanks— —Specification (First Revision)	IS 6551:1971	1992-12-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
24.	IS 6664:1992 Rubber microcellular sheets for soles and heels—Specification (First Revision)	IS 6664 : 1972	1992-12-31
25.	IS 6849 (Part 2) : 1993 Positive displacement vacuum pumps—measurement of performance characteristics Part 2 Measurement of Ultimate pressure (First Revision)	IS 6849 (Part 2) : 1973	1993-01-31
26.	IS 7296 : 1992 Test chart for woodworking surface planing and thicknessing machines (First Revision)	IS 7296 : 1974	1992-12-31
27.	IS 7635 : 1992 2-Nitroaniline—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 7635 : 1975	1992-12-31
28.	IS 7636 : 1992 4-Chloro-2-Toluidine—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 7636 : 1975	1992-12-31
29.	IS 7806 : 1993 Martensitic steel and austenitic high alloy steel castings for high temperature corrosion services— Specification (Second Revision)	IS 7806 : 1985	1993-01-31
30.	IS 8092 : 1992 Code for inspection of surface quality of steel castings for valves, fittings and other piping components (Visual Method) (First Revision)	IS 8092 : 1976	1992-11-30
31.	IS 9419 : 1993 Pusher legs—Specification (First Revision)	IS 9419 : 1980	1993-02-28
32.	IS 9654 : 1993 Information on ferrite materials to be supplied by manufacturers of transformers and inductor cores (First Revision)	IS 9654 : 1980	1993-02-28
33.	IS 9944 : 1992 Natural and man-made fibre rope slings— Recommendations on safe working loads (First Revision)	IS 9949 : 1981	1992-10-31
34.	IS 10502 : 1993 Gaur Gum., food grade—Specification (First Revision)	IS 10502 : 1985	1993-02-28
35.	IS 11611 : 1992 Fire test for valves (including soft seated quarter turn valve)—Method of test (First Revision)	IS 11611 : 1986	1992-12-31
36.	IS 12970 (Part 2/Sec 3) : 1993 Semiconductor devices— integrated circuits Part 2 digital integrated circuits—Essential rating and characteristics Section 3 Integrated circuit Microprocessors	IS 7441 (Part 1) 1974	1993-02-28
37.	IS 12970 (Part 3/Sec 2) : 1992 Semiconductor-Devices— Integrated circuits Part 3 Digital integrated circuits— Measuring methods Section 2 Static Characteristics	-do-	1992-12-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
38.	IS 12970 (Part 5/Sec 3) : 1992 Semiconductor Devices— Integrated Circuits Part 5 “Analogue integrated circuits— Essential ratings and characteristics Section 3 Audio amplifier”, Video amplifiers and Multichannel amplifiers for Telecommunications.	IS 7441 (Part 1) 1974—Contd.	1992-12-31
39.	IS 13252 : 1992 Safety of information technology equipment— including electrical business equipment		1992-10-31
40.	IS 13381 : 1992 Potassium carbonate, anhydrous and sesquihydrate, photographic grade— Specification	—	1992-11-30
41.	IS 13466 : 1992 Brushes for electrical machines— Specification	—	1992-12-31
42.	IS 13525 : 1992 Flexible conductors for carbon brushes— Specification	—	1992-12-31
43.	IS 13540 (Part 1) : 1992 Arms and ammunition—4.5 mm (.177) air rifle and air pistol pellets (Part 1 General Purpose)	—	1992-12-31
44.	IS 13557 (Part 14) : 1993 Information processing systems— Vocabulary Part 14 Reliability, Maintenance and availability	—	1993-01-31
45.	IS 13590 : 1992 Acetoacet-2-Anisidide— Specification	—	1992-12-31
46.	IS 13595 : 1992 Silver oxide zinc batteries for aircraft— Specification	—	1992-12-31
47.	IS 13596 : 1993 Dimensional tolerances on grinding wheels		1993-01-31
48.	IS 13606 : 1993 Synthetic sulphochlorinated fatliquore for leather processing— Specification	—	1993-01-31
49.	IS 13607 : 1992 Ready mixed paint, finishing, general purposes, synthetic— Specification	—	1992-12-31
50.	IS 13617 : 1992 Evaluation of pressure drop versus flow characteristic of pneumatic filters— Method of test	—	1992-12-31
51.	IS 13623 : 1993 Criteria for choice of gates and hoists	—	1993-02-28
52.	IS 13626 : 1993 Textile dyestuffs— dispersibility of disperse dyes— Determination	—	1993-02-28
53.	IS 13641 : 1992 Pesticides—Metalaxyl WS— Specification	—	1992-12-31
54.	IS 13647 : 1993 Electroplated coatings of Rhodium for engineering purposes— Specification	—	1993-02-28

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: Bombay, Calcutta, Chandigarh, and Madras and also Branch Offices: Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Patna and Trivandrum.

[No. CMD/13 : 2]
N. SRINIVASAN, Addl. Director General

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय

(शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का.आ. 1950.—भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1925 (1925 का 19) की धारा 8 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित सार्वजनिक संस्था का नाम एतद्द्वारा जोड़ती है, अर्थात्:—

“भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान, बंगलौर।”

[फा. सं. 3-18/89 - टी डी 2/टी. एस. I]

डा. डी. के. शर्मा उप शिक्षा सलाहकार (त.)

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1950.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 8 of the Provident Funds Act, 1925 (19 of 1925), the Central Government hereby adds the name of the following public institution to the Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

“Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore.”

[F. No. 3-18/89-TD.II/TS.I]

DR. D. K. SHARMA, Dy. Educational Adviser (T)

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का.आ. 1951.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 140, तारीख 23 जनवरी, 1993 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजनार्थ उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 01 फरवरी, 1993 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिए;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त धारा की उपधारा (4) प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आगे यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए सभी विलयनों से मुक्त इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा:—

तहसील : झज्जर	अनुसूची		राज्य : हरियाणा		
	हदबस्त नं.	मुस्ततिल नं.	क्षेत्रफल		
गांव का नाम		किला नं.	हेक्टर	आर.	सेटीग्रार
मछरोली	240	34			
		18/3	00	02	53

[संख्या आर - 31015/21/92 - ओ. आर. - 1]

ज. के. मायल, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1951.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S. O. 140, dated the 23rd January, 1993, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) hereinafter referred to as the said Act, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transport of petroleum;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on 1st February, 1993;

And whereas the Competent Authority in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act has made his report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the General Government hereby declares that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-section (4) of the said section, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, free from all encumbrances, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

Schedule

Tehsil: Jhajjar District: Rohtak State: Haryana

Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustateel/Killa No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Centi-are
1	2	3	4	5	6
Machhroli	240	34			
		18/3	00	02	53

[No. R-31015/21/92—C.R.I.]

J. K. MAYALL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1993

का.आ. 1952.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 394, तारीख 01 फरवरी, 1992 को अधिकांत करते हुए श्री डी. एम. सेठ, मामलातदार को भी, जो इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड कांडला भटिंडा पाइपलाइन, 355, सेक्टर, 12 बी. आर. एम. शाह चैम्बर, टैगोर रोड, गांधीधाम (कच्छ) में प्रतिनियुक्ति पर हैं कांडला भटिंडा पाइपलाइन परियोजना के संबंध में संपूर्ण गुजरात राज्य में उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. आर - 31015/25/93 - ओ. आर. - 1]

ज. के. मायल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1952.—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S. O. 394, dated the 1st February, 1992, the Central Government hereby also authorises Shri D. M. Sheth, Mamlatdar, on deputation with Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Kandla-Bhatinda Pipeline Project, 355, Sector-12/B, M. R. Shah Chambers, Tagore Road, Gandhidham (Kutch) Gujarat, to perform the function of the Competent Authority under the said Act in the whole of the State of Gujarat in respect of Kandla-Bhatinda Pipeline Project.

[No. R-3.015/25/93-OR-I]
J. K. MAYALL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ 1953:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में त्रिमगाम से हजिया गा. राज्य में पानीपत तक राजस्थान से होकर पैट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइप-लाइन बिछाई जाए:

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजनों के लिए हम अधिसूचना में उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है:

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पैट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के लिए आशय की घोषणा करती है।

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में अतिरिक्त कोई व्यक्ति, भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित हुए अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ माध्याम जनता को उपलब्ध करा देने जाने की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन या भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में आपत्ति निहित रूप में श्री श्रीराम वर्मा सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, डी-45/बी गुवाप मार्ग, 'सो' ब्लॉक, जयपुर-302 001 को कर गवेगा।

अनुसूची

सहस्री : गण्डवाडा जिला : मिरोही राज्य : राजस्थान

गांव का नाम खसरा नम्बर क्षेत्र

हेक्टेयर आरे मैटीअरे

1	2	3	4	5
बाड़ा	691	0	12	32
	701	0	03	08
	774	0	05	50
	775	0	02	64
	781	0	03	52
	781/2588	0	01	65
	783	0	16	06
	784	0	05	28

1	2	3	4	5
बाड़ा	785	0	03	08
	787	0	01	76
	790	0	04	95
	792	0	01	76
	808	0	01	32
	809	0	07	92
	812	0	02	64
	814/2586	0	09	90
	815	0	15	95
	838	0	06	60
	839	0	06	16
	841	0	07	70
	851	0	06	05
	852	0	04	18
	853	0	14	52
	860	0	01	98
भारजा	209	0	04	40
	210	0	12	00
	212	0	12	32
	213	0	00	21
	216	0	09	02
	217	0	01	54
	218	0	26	84
	509	0	03	95
	515	0	21	32
	519	0	08	02
	520	0	13	64
	521	0	00	80
	528	0	08	36
	531	0	09	68
	539	0	14	52
	550	0	30	22
	553	0	13	04
	592	0	29	88
	599	0	05	28
	603	0	04	51
	604	0	06	38
	605	0	03	96
	629	0	03	30
	630	0	12	10
	642	0	01	98
	643/1	0	06	60
	643/2	0	07	81
	676	0	00	88
	677	0	08	80
	678	0	06	82
	679	0	10	56
	680	0	00	99
	685	0	12	54
	689	0	05	22
	690	0	18	72
	691	0	13	20
	861	0	01	54
	862	0	00	32
भीमान	114	1	30	20

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
मोसना	148	0	46	90	भावर	1363	0	02	42
	271	0	00	88		1364	0	08	72
	271	1	01	36		1951	0	57	68
	282	0	06	16		1955	0	66	88
	283	0	17	28		1992	0	77	36
	284	0	03	81		1993	0	12	22
	295	0	06	60	बनारी	169	0	03	96
	296	0	06	82		176	0	75	24
	303	0	10	56		178	0	06	60
	307	0	08	80		179	0	00	41
	312	0	09	68		246	0	03	36
	313	0	21	12		247	0	09	12
	326	0	02	64		251	0	08	14
	327	0	12	00		252	0	00	44
	328	0	01	80		254	0	06	16
	329	0	06	60		255	0	05	94
	330	0	04	62		266	0	07	92
	336	0	06	09		267	0	06	16
	337	0	00	24		269	0	00	66
बाटेरा	33	0	03	52		1874	0	01	76
	35	0	06	27		1879	0	05	50
	36	0	06	60		1880	0	08	14
	37	0	14	96		1881	0	09	90
	41	0	05	00		1892	0	02	86
	42	0	03	60		1900	0	18	04
	47	0	02	86		1902	0	06	60
	53	0	04	40		1907	0	03	96
	54	0	07	04		1909	0	06	16
	55	0	04	18		1911	0	07	00
	58	0	95	48		2087/1911	0	00	04
	62	0	03	52		1911	0	02	42
	66	0	01	32		1942	0	09	02
	67	0	25	96		1943	0	12	32
	817	0	75	90		1944	0	07	48
	981	0	23	32		1952	0	03	96
	982	0	03	74		2011	0	00	12
	983	0	37	18		2013	0	01	60
	985	0	25	30		2014	0	04	48
	990	0	00	44		2015	0	07	70
	1010	0	12	32		2016	0	08	80
	1011	0	08	47		2017	0	03	96
	1012	0	07	92		2027	0	03	30
	1014	0	14	42		2032	0	00	36
	1016	0	09	34		2033	0	06	16
	1017	0	00	88		2035	0	02	86
भाबरी	1296	0	06	16		2036	0	06	16
	1297	0	09	68		2038	0	06	16
	1298	0	04	18		2039	0	11	22
	1303	0	08	16		2081	0	17	52
	1304	1	02	19	कोदगना	361	0	03	30
	1323	0	02	64		363	0	00	16
	1324	1	09	56		364	0	06	38
	1326	0	00	24		366	0	03	96

1	2	3	4	5
कदरला (मार्ग)	402	0	00	88
	406	0	00	44
	414	0	07	15
	415	0	00	21
	417	0	05	28
	418	0	09	02
	419	0	04	84
	448	0	20	68
	452	0	11	66
	453	0	10	56
	463	0	45	75
	479	0	08	40
	576	0	05	52
	577	0	04	90
	578	0	07	26
	585	0	00	30
	586	0	11	58
	587	0	04	84
	589	0	12	10
	590	0	07	48
	595	0	07	48
	596	0	02	47
	599	0	02	20
	601	0	04	18
	607	0	03	08
	609	0	10	12

[सं. प्रार—31015/14/93—ओ. प्रार.—I]

जे. के. मावेल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1953.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Viramgam in the State of Gujarat to Panipat in the State of Haryana, via Rajasthan, pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within 21 days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri Shree Ram Verma, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, D45/B, Subhash Marg, 'C' Scheme, Jaipur-302 001.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Pindwara		District : Sirohi		State : Rajasthan	
Name of Village		Khasra No.		Area	
				Hec-tare	Are Centiare
1	2	3	4	5	
Vada	691	0	12	32	
	701	0	03	08	
	774	0	05	50	
	775	0	02	64	
	781	0	03	52	
	781/2588	0	01	65	
	783	0	16	06	
	784	0	05	28	
	785	0	03	08	
	787	0	01	76	
	790	0	04	95	
	792	0	01	76	
	808	0	01	32	
	809	0	07	92	
	812	0	02	64	
	814/2586	0	09	90	
	815	0	15	95	
	838	0	06	60	
	839	0	06	16	
	841	0	07	70	
	851	0	06	05	
	852	0	04	18	
	853	0	14	52	
	860	0	01	98	
Bharja	209	0	04	40	
	210	0	12	00	
	212	0	12	32	
	213	0	00	21	
	216	0	09	02	
	217	0	01	54	
	218	0	26	84	
	509	0	03	96	
	515	0	12	32	
	519	0	08	02	
	520	0	13	64	
	521	0	00	80	
	528	0	08	36	
	531	0	09	68	
	539	0	14	52	
	550	0	30	22	
	553	0	13	04	
	592	0	29	88	
	599	0	05	28	
	603	0	04	51	
	604	0	06	38	
	605	0	03	96	
	629	0	03	30	
	630	0	12	10	
	643/1	0	06	60	
	643/2	0	07	81	
	676	0	00	88	
	677	0	08	80	
	678	0	06	82	
	679	0	10	56	
	680	0	00	99	

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Bharja (contd.)	685	0	12	54	Bhawari (contd.)	1955	0	66	88
	689	0	05	22		1992	0	77	36
	690	0	18	72		1993	0	10	22
	691	0	13	20	Dhanari	169	0	03	96
	861	0	01	54		176	0	7	24
	862	0	00	32		178	0	06	60
	642	0	01	98		179	0	00	44
Bhimana	144	1	30	20		246	0	03	36
	148	0	46	90		247	0	00	12
	271	0	00	88		251	0	08	14
	274	0	01	56		252	0	00	44
	282	0	06	16		254	0	06	16
	283	0	17	28		255	0	05	94
	284	0	03	84		266	0	07	92
	295	0	06	60		267	0	06	16
	296	0	06	82		269	0	00	66
	303	0	10	56		1874	0	01	76
	307	0	08	80		1879	0	05	50
	312	0	09	68		1880	0	08	14
	313	0	21	12		1881	0	09	90
	326	0	02	64		1892	0	02	86
	327	0	12	00		1900	0	18	04
	328	0	01	80		1902	0	06	60
	329	0	06	60		1907	0	03	96
	330	0	04	62		1909	0	06	16
	336	0	06	09		1911	0	07	00
	337	0	00	24		2087/1911	0	00	0
Watera	33	0	03	52		1941	0	02	42
	35	0	06	27		1942	0	0	02
	36	0	06	60		1943	0	12	32
	37	0	14	96		1944	0	07	48
	41	0	05	00		1952	0	03	96
	42	0	03	60		2011	0	00	12
	47	0	02	86		2013	0	01	60
	53	0	04	40		2014	0	04	48
	54	0	07	04		2015	0	07	70
	58	0	95	48		2016	0	08	80
	62	0	03	52		2017	0	03	96
	55	0	04	18		2027	0	03	30
	66	0	01	32		2032	0	00	36
	67	0	25	96		2033	0	06	16
	817	0	75	90		2035	0	02	86
	981	0	23	32		2036	0	06	16
	982	0	03	74		2038	0	06	16
	983	0	37	18		2039	0	11	22
	985	0	25	30		2081	0	47	52
	990	0	00	44	Kodralla	361	0	03	30
	1010	0	12	32		363	0	00	16
	1011	0	08	47		364	0	06	38
	1012	0	07	92		366	0	03	96
	1014	0	14	42		402	0	00	88
	1016	0	09	34		406	0	00	44
	1017	0	00	88		414	0	07	15
Bhawari	1296	0	05	16		415	0	00	24
	1297	0	09	68		417	0	05	28
	1298	0	04	18		418	0	09	02
	1303	0	06	16		419	0	04	84
	1304	1	02	19		448	0	20	68
	1323	0	02	64		452	0	11	66
	1324	1	09	56		453	0	10	56
	1326	0	00	24		463	0	45	75
	1363	0	02	42		479	0	08	40
	1364	0	08	72		576	0	05	52
	1954	0	53	68		577	0	04	90
						578	0	07	26

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Kodralla (contd.)	585	0	00	30	तर्तुलो—जारी	373	0	05	98
	586	0	11	58		374	0	81	38
	587	0	04	84		391	0	00	48
	589	0	12	10	अज्ञात	117	0	06	16
	590	0	07	48		119	0	05	94
	595	0	07	48		124	0	02	09
	596	0	02	47		134	0	01	32
	599	0	02	20		135	0	07	48
	601	0	04	18		136	0	02	76
	607	0	03	08		137	0	00	48
	609	0	10	12		146	0	29	72

[No. R-31015/44/93/OR-I]
J.K. MAYALL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1954—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में विरमगाम से हरियाणा राज्य में पानीपत तक राजस्थान में होकर पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाए ;

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजनों के लिए इस अधिसूचना में उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के लिए प्राण्य की घोषणा करती है ;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितशुद्ध कोई व्यक्ति भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिये जाने की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन या भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में आपत्ति लिखित रूप में श्री श्री राम वर्मा सश्रम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, सी - 45 बी, मुभाष मार्ग, "सी" स्कीम, जयपुर - 302001 को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : आबूरोड़ जिला : सिराही राज्य : राजस्थान

शॉव का नाम	खसरा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	वर्ग-मीटर	
1	2	3	4	5
तर्तुलो	327	0	00	68
	335	0	25	95
	336	0	09	68
	348/2	0	00	60
	350	0	04	44
	351	0	00	70
	352	0	09	52
	370/1	0	04	32
	370/2	0	10	56
	371	0	00	15
	372	0	03	60

और

1	0	06	80
10	0	07	00
11	0	03	48
12	0	01	12
13	0	10	18
29	0	00	44
30	0	08	58
33	0	06	78
34	0	00	24
35	0	00	56
36	0	04	48
185	0	03	86
186	0	04	12
192	0	08	36
193	0	06	16
194	0	04	84
195	0	04	38
196	0	07	48

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
और-जारी	197	0	00	10	किबर्ली-जारी	819	0	03	36
	198	0	17	56		850	0	00	34
	210	0	06	60		853	0	03	96
	214	0	00	44		854	0	04	70
	215	0	08	36		857	0	05	72
	216	0	08	80		858	0	00	40
	223	0	02	26		870	0	01	32
	224	0	11	52		902	0	08	36
	229	0	00	34		907	0	02	80
	233	0	00	55		912	0	07	48
	284	0	06	16		918	0	07	48
	286	0	06	82		922	0	02	62
	287	0	07	26		925	0	00	96
	295	0	11	66		926	0	00	24
	299	0	07	46		927	0	00	20
	300	0	02	42		928	0	02	56
	301	0	01	44		949	0	02	62
	306	0	09	97		943	0	00	88
	307	0	02	17		944	0	07	04
	308	0	08	58		962	0	00	88
	311	0	11	06		963	0	17	60
	312	0	02	70		978	0	03	96
मीथरला	8	0	02	72		979	0	05	72
	12	0	03	64		989	0	05	48
	13	0	02	88		990	0	02	22
	45	0	07	92		991	0	00	38
	46	0	07	76		992	0	02	40
	51	0	05	68		993	0	02	40
	52	0	00	40		1201	0	04	51
	46	0	13	84		1203	0	00	64
	59	0	05	28		1204	0	04	10
	79	0	01	16		1205	0	05	35
किबर्ली	536	0	00	84		1210	0	00	16
	557	0	02	74		1212	0	02	12
	559	0	14	36		1220	0	04	84
	560	0	01	42		1228	0	08	20
	564	0	09	98		1229	0	04	68
	634	0	02	52		1230	0	05	74
	762	0	00	22		1232	0	01	34
	764	0	02	64		1243	0	01	44
	766	0	07	58		1244	0	07	08
	771	0	11	54		1245	0	07	92
	773	0	01	42		1246	0	07	92
	774	0	01	42		1255	0	06	44
	778	0	00	66		1256	0	01	49
	780	0	02	20		1270	0	04	84
	781	0	15	40		1271	0	02	86
	782	0	08	40		1273	0	07	48
	818	0	01	32		1283	0	00	98
	830	0	00	54		1284	0	01	64
	831	0	02	20		1286	0	05	72
	833	0	01	32		1287	0	05	92
	846	0	01	78		1288	0	07	24
	847	0	05	76		1292	0	09	04
	848	0	00	52		1300	0	03	52

1	2	3	4	5
किबरली—जारी	1301	0	05	72
	1302	0	04	62
	1303	0	04	40
	1314	0	09	46
	1320	0	02	20
	1321	0	09	64

[सं. आर- 31015/44/93-ओ आर-1]

ज. के. मागल, ग्रवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1954.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Viramgam in the State of Gujarat to Panipat in the State of Haryana, via Rajasthan, pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within 21 days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri Sri Ram Verma, competent authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, D-45/B, Subhash Marg, 'C' Scheme, Jaipur-302 001.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Abu Road District : Sirohi State : Rajasthan				
Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
		Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
Tartoli	327	0	00	68
	335	0	25	95
	336	0	09	68
	348/2	0	00	60
	350	0	04	44
	351	0	00	70
	352	0	09	52
	370/1	0	04	32
	370/2	0	10	56
	371	0	00	15
	372	0	03	60
	373	0	05	98
	374	0	81	38
	391	0	90	48
	117	0	06	16
	119	0	05	94
	124	0	02	09
Khadate	134	0	01	32
	135	0	07	48
	136	0	02	76

1	2	3	4	5
Khkdak—Conld.	137	0	00	48
	146	0	29	72
	223	0	13	32
	224	0	07	04
	225	0	07	48
	236	0	01	32
	254	0	09	56
	255	0	13	64
	259	0	08	91
	260	0	64	74
	271	0	07	92
	516	0	02	00
	517	0	16	66
	520	0	11	34
	521	0	06	84
	522	0	08	20
	539	0	03	70
	540	0	10	80
	541	0	05	76
	547	0	01	44
Aor	570	0	14	94
	571	0	18	02
	572	0	05	94
	581	0	04	14
	584	0	10	26
	586	0	01	08
	587	0	02	88
	1	0	06	80
	10	0	07	00
	11	0	03	48
	12	0	01	12
	13	0	10	18
	29	0	00	44
	30	0	08	58
	33	0	06	78
	34	0	00	24
	35	0	00	56
	36	0	04	48
	185	0	03	86
	186	0	04	12
	192	0	08	36
	193	0	06	16
	194	0	04	84
	195	0	04	38
	196	0	07	48
	197	0	00	10
	198	0	17	56
	210	0	06	60
	214	0	00	44
	215	0	08	36
	216	0	08	80
	223	0	02	26
	224	0	11	52
	229	0	00	33
	233	0	00	55
	284	0	06	16
	286	0	06	82
	287	0	07	26
	295	0	11	66
	299	0	07	46
	300	0	02	42
	301	0	01	44
	306	0	09	97
	307	0	02	17
	308	0	08	58

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Aor—contd.	311	0	11	06	Kivarli—contd.	1204	0	04	40
	312	0	02	70		1203	0	00	64
Morthala	8	0	02	72		1205	0	05	88
	12	0	03	64		1210	0	00	16
	13	0	02	88		1212	0	02	12
	45	0	07	92		1220	0	04	84
	46	0	07	76		1228	0	08	20
	51	0	05	68		1229	0	04	68
	52	0	00	40		1230	0	05	74
	56	0	13	84		1232	0	01	34
	59	0	05	28		1243	0	01	44
	79	0	01	16		1244	0	07	08
						1245	0	07	92
Kivarli	536	0	00	84		1246	0	07	92
	557	0	02	74		1255	0	06	44
	559	0	14	36		1256	0	01	49
	560	0	01	42		1270	0	04	84
	564	0	09	98		1271	0	02	86
	634	1	02	52		1273	0	07	43
	762	0	00	22		1283	0	00	98
	764	0	02	64		1284	0	01	64
	766	0	07	58		1286	0	05	72
	771	0	11	54		1287	0	05	92
	773	0	01	42		1288	0	07	24
	774	0	01	42		1292	0	09	04
	779	0	00	66		1300	0	03	52
	780	0	02	20		1301	0	05	7
	781	0	15	40		1302	0	04	62
	782	0	08	80		1303	0	04	40
	818	0	01	32		1314	0	09	46
	830	0	00	54		1320	0	02	20
	831	0	02	20		1321	0	09	64
	833	0	01	32					
	846	0	01	28					
	847	0	05	76					
	848	0	00	52					
	849	0	03	36					
	850	0	00	34					
	853	0	03	96					
	854	0	04	70					
	855	0	05	72					
	856	0	00	40					
	870	0	01	32					
	904	0	08	36					
	907	0	02	80					
	912	0	07	48					
	918	0	07	48					
	922	0	02	62					
	925	0	00	96					
	926	0	00	24					
	927	0	02	20					
	928	0	02	56					
	929	0	06	62					
	943	0	00	88					
	944	0	07	04					
	962	0	00	88					
	963	0	17	60					
	978	0	03	96					
	979	0	05	72					
	989	0	05	48					
	990	0	02	22					
	991	0	00	38					
	992	0	02	40					
	993	0	02	40					
	1201	0	04	51					

[No. R-31015/44/93-O.R.-I]

J.K. MAYALL, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 1994

कां०आ० 1955.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) प्रथम अनुसूची में “कलकत्ता विश्वविद्यालय” शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत “डॉक्टर ऑफ मेडिसिन (ट्रापिकल मेडिसिन), एम०डी० (ट्रापिकल मेडिसिन)” प्रविष्टि के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि अन्तःस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—
- “डिप्लोमा इन ट्रापिकल मेडिसिन एंड हाइजिन (डी०टी०एम० एंड एच०)”

[सं. वी०-11015/2/94-एम०ई० (य०जी०)]

शरन कुमार मिश्र, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1994

S.O. 1955.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government after consulting the Medical Council of India hereby makes the following further amendment in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely :—

- (1) in the First Schedule, under the heading "Calcutta University" after the entry "Doctor of Medicine, (Tropical Medicine), M. D. (Tropical Medicine)", the following entry shall be inserted, namely :—
"Diploma in Tropical Medicine & Hygiene (D.T.M. and H.)".

[No. V. 11015/2/94-ME (UG)]
S. K. MISHRA, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1994

का०आ० 1956.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अन्तर्गण में, डा० (श्रीमती) एम० यशोदा शरीर रचना विज्ञान का प्रोफेसर और उसका विभागाध्यक्ष, बंगलौर मेडिकल कालेज, बंगलौर को, बंगलौर विश्वविद्यालय द्वारा भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया गया है,

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों के अन्तर्गण में, भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का०आ० 138, तारीख 9 जनवरी, 1960 में और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :

उक्त अधिसूचना में "धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शीर्ष के नीचे निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्यांक और प्रविष्टि जोड़ी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

"41 डा० (श्रीमती) एम० यशोदा,

शरीर रचना विज्ञान का प्रोफेसर और उसका विभागाध्यक्ष,
बंगलौर मेडिकल कालेज,
बंगलौर-560002"

[संख्यांक० 11013/5/94-एम०ई० (यू०जी०)]

एम०के० मिश्र, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1994

S.O. 1956.—Whereas in pursuance of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), Dr. (Mrs.) S. Yeshoda, Professor and Head of the Department of Anatomy, Bangalore Medical College, Bangalore has been elected by the Bangalore University to be a member of the Medical Council of India ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the further amendments in the notification of Government of India in the then Ministry of

Health number S.O. 138, dated 9th January, 1960, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading "Elected under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3", the following serial number and entry shall be added, namely :—

"41. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Yeshoda,
Prof. & Head of the Department of Anatomy,
Bangalore Medical College,
Bangalore-560 002."

[No. V. 11013/5/94-ME (UG)]

S. K. MISHRA, Desk Officer.

संचार मंत्रालय

(दूरसंचार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1994

का०आ० 1957.—यतः केन्नानूर तथा बलियापट्टम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज प्रणाली के स्थानीय क्षेत्रों के संशोधन के लिए भारतीय तार नियमावली, 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (2) (ग) के तहत केन्नानूर तथा बलियापट्टम में परिचालित होले वाले समाचार पत्रों में एक सार्वजनिक सूचना प्रकाशित की गयी थी, जिसमें इस संशोधन से प्रभावित होने वाले सभी सम्भावित व्यक्तियों से इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के बाद 30 दिन की समयावधि के भीतर आपत्तियां एवं सुझाव आमंत्रित किए गए थे।

और यतः उक्त सूचना 30-9-93 को मातृभूमि, मलायला मनोरमा, चन्द्रिका, केरल कौमुदी एवं इंडियन एक्सप्रेस समाचार पत्रों द्वारा जनता तक पहुंचा दी गई थी,

और यतः उक्त सूचना के संबंध में जनता से कोई आपत्तियां व सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए हैं,

अतः अब उपरोक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (2) (ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महा-निदेशक, दूरसंचार एतद्वारा यह घोषणा करने हैं कि दिनांक 16-8-94 से केन्नानूर तथा बलियापट्टम के संशोधित स्थानीय क्षेत्र निम्नलिखित प्रकार से होंगे :—

1. केन्नानूर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज प्रणाली :

केन्नानूर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में यह क्षेत्र समाविष्ट होगा जो केन्नानूर नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार के अन्तर्गत आता है, लेकिन शर्त यह है कि वे टेलीफोन उपभोक्ता जो केन्नानूर को नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर रहते हैं परन्तु केन्नानूर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज प्रणाली सेवाएं प्राप्त करते हैं, वे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क भुगतान करते रहेंगे, जब तक (क) वे इस प्रणाली के किसी एक्सचेंज से 5 कि०मी० की दूरी के भीतर स्थित हों और (ख) इस तथ्य के बावजूद कि वे किसी समीपवर्ती एक्सचेंज प्रणाली के स्थानीय क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत आते हैं, विभागीय कारणों से इस एक्सचेंज से जुड़े हुए हों।

2. बलियापट्टम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज प्रणाली :

बलियापट्टम टेलीफोन प्रणाली के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में यह क्षेत्र समाविष्ट होगा जो बलियापट्टम टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से

5 कि.मी. की लम्बाई (रेडियल) दूरी के भीतर आता है, बशर्ते कि यह सीमा निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों तक सीमित होगी।

पश्चिम में अरब सागर तक, उत्तर में, बलियापट्टम नदी के किनारे तक, इरिनावू नदी के किनारे इरिनावू बांध तक, इरिनावू रोड के उस छोर तक जहां पयगड़ी रोड इससे मिलता है, तत्पश्चात् चेक्कीकुंडू से होते हुए कच्चा रोड से पालियायुवलप्पू तक एवं केन्तूर तालुक सीमा से अंचम-पीडिका तक, पूर्व में बलियापट्टम नदी और कटमपल्ली नदी तक, दक्षिण में विरक्कल ग्राम सीमा के उस छोर तक जहां यह सीमा पल्लिकुलम स्थित राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग-17 से मिलती है राजस उच्च विद्यालय रोड तक के उस छोर तक जहां इस रोड से अलाविल-बलियापट्टम रोड तक जो पन्नेरिमुक्कु तक है, नेताजी रोड से पूतपाड़ा तक और तत्पश्चात् चैन्मा-स्सरीपाड़ा रोड तक।

[सं. 3-2/92-पी.एच.बी.]

गुरुदीप सिंह, निदेशक (फोन-ई)

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(Department of Telecommunications)

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1994

S.O. 1957.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Cannanore and Baliapattom Telephone Exchange Systems was published as required by rule 434(III) (2)(C) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Cannanore and Baliapattom, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 30-9-1993 in Mathrubhumi, Malayala Manorama, Chandrika, Kerala Kaumudi and The Indian Express newspapers;

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 434(III) (2)(C) of the said Rules, the Director General Telecommunications hereby declares that with effect from 16-8-94 the revised local area of Cannanore and Baliapattom shall be as under :—

1. Cannore Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Cannanore Telephone System shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Cannanore Municipality; provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Cannanore Municipal Limited but who are served from Cannanore Telephone System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as (a) they are located within 5 kms. of any exchange of this system and (b) remain connection to it due to departmental reasons notwithstanding the fact that they may fall within the local area of any adjacent telephone system.

2. Baliapattom Telephones Exchange System.—The local area of Baliapattom Telephone System shall cover an area falling within 5 kms. radial distance from Baliapattom Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Arabian Sea in the West, Baliapattom river bank, Irinavu river bank upto Irinavu Dam, Irinavu road upto the point where it meets the Puyangadi road, thereafter the Kutcha road via chekkikundu upto Paliathuvalappu and Cannanore taluk boundary upto Anchampeedika in the North, Baliapattom river and Kattampally river in the East, Chirakkal village boundary upto the point where it meets NH-17 at Pallikulam, Rajas High School road upto the point where it meets Alavil-Baliapattom road upto Pannerimukku, Nethaji Road upto Pothapara and thereafter Chemmasserypara road in the South.

[F. No. 3-2/92-PHB]

GURDIP SINGH, Director (Phones-E).

1774 GI/94—4

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 1994

का.जा. 1958.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एक्सपोर्ट क्रेडिट और ग्यारेन्टी कार्पोरेशन के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल 12012/156/91-आ.ई.प्रार. (बी-2)]

बी. के. शर्मा, डेस्क ऑफिसर

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 14th July, 1994

S.O. 1958.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Export Credit and Guarantee Corp. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-7-1994.

[No. L-12012/156/91-IR(B-II)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU
MADRAS

Wednesday, the 16th day of March, 1994

PRESENT :

Thiru K. Sampath Kumaran, B.A.B.L., Industrial Tribunal,
Industrial Dispute No. 60/91

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workman and the Management of Export Credit Guarantee Corporation, Madras).

BETWEEN

Shri P. Muralidharan,
No. 16, Sri Devi Prasad, 25th Street,
Thillai Ganga Nagar, Nanganallur,
Madras-600061.

AND

The Manager,
Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of
India Ltd.,

770-A, Spencers Towers, 7th Floor, Anna Salai,
Madras-600002.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-12012/156/91-IR.B.II, dated 1-10-91, Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Friday, the 4th day of March, 1994 upon perusing the reference, Claim and Counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Tvl. N. G. R. Prasad and S. Vaidyanathan for Tvl. Row and Reddy, Advocates appearing for the Workman and of Tvl. Sanjay Mohan and C. Manohar Gupta for Tvl. Ramasubramaniam and Associates, Advocates appearing for the Management and this dispute having stood over till this day for consideration this Tribunal made the following :—

AWARD

This reference has been made for the adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the action of the Management of ECGC in terminating the service of Shri P. Muralidharan,

Clerk-cum-Typist is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. The allegation in the Claim Statement are as follows :

The respondent namely the Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Ltd., is a Central Government Undertaking, in which the petitioner was employed as Clerk-cum-Typist on monthly wages from 22-10-87. He continued in employment till 5th January, 1990, when by a letter dated 5-1-90, his services were abruptly terminated without any notice whatsoever. Except for 3 months i.e. February, April, May, 1988, he was issued regular appointment orders from time to time, and even during some periods of short breaks for which there was no official appointment order, his services as Clerk-cum-Typist were utilised, and for such periods, he was paid wages by the respondent. The respondent issued to the petitioner, during employments between 22nd October, 1987 and 5th January, 1990, in all twenty two appointment letters, each for one month period. This the respondent had done to circumvent the law and to deprive the petitioner of his legitimate wages and other benefits that a permanent employee would get for such work. By this process, the respondent had denied him also permanency of employment, when regular vacancy for permanent post occurred. The petitioner must be treated as permanent and given all the benefits of permanency, because, he has completed 480 days within a period of 24 calendar months, according to Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Confirmation of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981. The termination on the ground that he is temporary is illegal. This method of appointment and termination, when there is work of permanent nature has been deprecated by the Supreme Court in 1986 I-LLJ p. 127. This method of appointment amounts to unfair labour practice as per item 10 of the 5th schedule to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The termination amounts to retrenchment. Since during a period of 12 calendar months he had worked for more than 240 days (including holidays and Sundays), the respondent should have complied with Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It was not done. Hence the termination is void. Many juniors to the petitioner are retained in service contrary to Section 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Since he has become a permanent employee, the respondent cannot get rid of his services except for misconduct, after holding an enquiry. The respondent cannot invoke a clause in the appointment letter and terminate his services. Such a clause is opposed to the Public Policy. The petitioner was required to appear for a test in which he came out successful for regular employment. But, after personal interview his claim for permanency to the post of Clerk-cum-Typist was denied for no just and valid grounds. The petitioner, during his period of employment under the respondent over 2 years, worked without any adverse remarks, and his work was greatly admired by the respondent. Without considering this, the respondent terminated the employment on the ground of efflux of time stipulated in the employment order. Even after the selection of candidates and appointments made against permanent vacancies, he was continued on temporary basis.

3. After his services were terminated, the petitioner has not been able to get employment. He is presently earning paltry amounts daily by doing job-typing work.

4. The respondent filed the following Counter :

The petition is not maintainable. Pending the recruitment of suitable persons in regular appointment to the post of Clerk-cum-Typist the respondent in order to cope up with the temporary situation such as leave vacancy etc., engaged the petitioner and others from time to time for specific periods purely on "ad hoc" basis. All appointments were for specific durations, and such appointments automatically came to an end on the expiry of the said period. If the requirement of the respondent company continued then, further appointments for similar specific periods were made keeping in view the fact that shortly thereafter regular appointments were to be made, and the persons so appointed in regular capacity must join. The petitioner was fully aware of the nature of the appointment and the engagements given to him, in that, they were purely temporary and were intended to meet temporary exigencies of work. The petitioner was aware that he did not obtain any right to any post or appointment in the respondent-company in view of such temporary appointments. Specific letters discontinuing the service of the petitioner were issued from time to time. The question of appointing suitable persons for the vacancies of Clerk-cum-Typist arose

during the end of 1987. There was correspondence between Head Office and the Regional Office on the question of appointing persons belonging to SC/ST categories exclusively in such posts, which necessitated repeated short term appointments like those issued to the petitioner. Recruitments were processed finally in the year 1988 and came to be finalised in the year 1989, and as and when the candidates regularly joined the posts, services of the temporary appointees like the petitioner had to be determined. In this background, it is not known as to how the petitioner could quarrel with the determination of service. It is imaginary that the petitioner's services as Clerk-cum-Typist were utilised even during the periods of break and he was paid wages by the respondent. The allegation that the termination is for no good reasonable cause and is a colourable exercise of power is untrue. While the minimum qualification prescribed for the post of Clerk-cum-Typist was Second Class graduation, the petitioner who is a third class graduate was still given an opportunity to appear for the test/interview. The claim of the petitioner that he should have been absorbed as permanent employee, when he was not found suitable in the test/interview that were held for ascertaining the suitability for such purposes appointment, is not maintainable. Other persons employed in similar temporary capacity at the relevant point of time were also given opportunity to appear for test/interview and some of such temporary employees were offered permanent posts in the Corporation based on their performance in the test/interview and standing in the merit list. The selection to the permanent posts were made in a systematic way after the due process of test/interview to fill up the posts with persons who satisfy the requirements of the respondent on merit. The petitioner who was given full and fair opportunity could not qualify. To allege that he should have been made permanent notwithstanding his failure in the test/interview to the petitioner were in the form of a contract of employments made in the respondent-company including that of the petitioner were made only on account of temporary exigencies which required such temporary appointments notwithstanding the permanent employment of the respondent in force at the relevant point of time. The reference to the Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Industrial and Establishment (Confirmation of Permanent Status to Workmen) is irrelevant. It applies only if atleast 50 workmen are employed in the office concerned. There is no continuous service as defined under the Act in view of the fact that the appointments issued to the petitioner were in the form of a contract of employment for a fixed period, and non-renewal of such contract would not make the determination of service illegal. The determination of petitioner's temporary service would not amount to retrenchment. As such compliance to Section 25-F and Section 25-B of the Industrial Disputes Act is not attracted. The contention that the petitioner's service cannot be determined except for misconduct proved in an enquiry is untenable.

5. It is denied that the petitioner came out successful in the test/interview. He failed to qualify and find a place in the merit list. If at all he was further employed, it was only as a temporary measure, and once the work in the respondent-company relating to the posts in question were regulated, such temporary appointments were stopped. The petitioner cannot claim that he was denied any opportunity to get permanent employment, having failed in his endeavour, on account of his own shortcomings. Therefore, petition may be dismissed.

6. The petitioner filed the following reply statement.—It is not the case of the respondent that the petitioner suppressed his qualification. They knew that petitioner is a third class graduate, and allowed him to work. There was no occasion to find fault with his work at any time. The petitioner's juniors Mrs. R. Indira and Mr. Vibinam were made permanent in violation of Section 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act. The Management is still continuing to give the work that was given to the petitioner to new temporaries in violation of Section 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act.

7. The issues that arise for consideration are :

1. Whether the petitioner was appointed purely on an ad hoc basis for a specific period and whether his employment came to an end automatically at the end of that period?
2. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioner amounts to retrenchment and is illegal?

3. Whether the petitioner has worked for more than 480 days during a period of 24 months prior to the termination of his services?
4. Whether the petitioner is entitled to be made permanent?
5. Whether the petitioner is estopped from claiming the right to become a permanent employee in view of his failure to qualify in the test/interview?
6. Whether the petitioner does not possess the requisite general educational qualification to hold the permanent post?

8. Points 1 to 4.—The petitioner was appointed as Clerk-cum-Typist under the respondent-management. According to him he was employed from 22-10-87 to 5-1-90, and his services were terminated with effect from 5-1-90 without any notice. The petitioner contends that he was issued employment orders from time to time and during the said period between 22-10-87 to 5-1-90, 22 appointment orders were issued to him. The petitioner contends that he has worked for more than 480 days continuously including Saturdays, and Sundays, within a period of 24 months preceding his termination, and that he should have been made permanent in view of the provision contained in Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981. The petitioner therefore contends that his termination amounts to retrenchment without any notice or compensation, and that, it is illegal and an unfair labour practice. But, the respondent-management on the other hand contends that pending recruitment of suitable persons on a regular basis and in order to cope up with the temporary situations like leave vacancies etc. the respondent engaged the petitioner, that it was purely on temporary adhoc basis for specific durations, and that such employments came to an end automatically by efflux of time i.e. on the expiry of the period mentioned in the appointment orders. The respondent also contends that at the end of every period, the petitioner was also issued orders terminating his services. The respondent also contends that there is no continuity of service since the appointments were made in the form of contract for fixed periods, and non-renewal of such contracts would not amount to retrenchment.

9. Therefore, we have to find out first the nature of appointment and whether the petitioner has completed more than 480 days of continuous service during the period of 24 months preceding the termination of the service. Exhibits W-2 to W-23 are the letters of appointment and the orders of termination of service issued to the petitioner. In exhibit W-2, we find the order dated 11-11-87 temporarily appointing the petitioner for a period of one month specifically mentioning that he is appointed purely on temporary basis for one month. Similar appointment orders were issued to him for about 1 month or little less period. Ex. W-23 is the last order of appointment dated 8-12-89 for the period from 8-12-89 to 7-1-90. Exhibit W-23 also contains another order dated 5-1-90 discharging him from service with effect from 5-1-90. So, though the petitioner has been in the service of the respondent from 22-10-87 to 5-1-90, 22 appointment orders were issued to him periodically mentioning that his services were purely temporary and are liable to be terminated at any time without any notice. At or at the end of each period he was also issued with orders of termination. Therefore, the respondent contends that since the appointment orders themselves were for specific periods the appointment came to an automatic end by efflux of the period of time, though orders were also issued terminating the services, and therefore, when the contract of service was not renewed, it cannot be stated that there is retrenchment.

10. But, the learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the respondent was not entitled to do so, and in spite of the periodical orders of appointment and termination of service, the petitioner must be held to have been in continuous service between 22-10-87 to 5-1-90, in spite of this method adopted by the respondent. The petitioner stated as WW1 that he worked continuously for more than 480 days during 24 months. He contends that when his employment ceased, he was not given any compensation. He also stated that the post which he occupied is a permanent one, though his appointment was temporary. MW1, the General Manager of the respondent also stated that it is a permanent post, and

there will always be work. So, we find that in a permanent post where there is always work, temporary appointments were made as in the case of the petitioner. It is also evident that the petitioner has been in employment, though under different appointment orders for specific periods from 22-10-87 to 5-1-90 for more than 2 years and the petitioner has been working under the respondent as a Clerk-cum-Typist. As pointed out already, the reason given by the respondent is that since it will take time to fill up the vacancies on a regular basis, temporary appointments were made. But, if that be the only reason, the appointments could have been made simply as a temporary measure without specifying the period. Even according to the respondent, the vacancies arose during 1987-88 and the process for filling up were started. The respondent knew that it will take time but yet purposely made appointments for one month or even a lesser period. So, obviously these temporary appointments are only made with a mala fide intention of not affording an opportunity to the petitioner to claim a permanent status. Even after the selection on regular basis was over, the petitioner was employed on a temporary basis.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the decision in *STATE BANK OF INDIA Vs. SUNDARAMONEY* (1976 1-LLJ p. 478) wherein it was held as follows:

"If the workman swims into the harbour of Section 25-F he cannot be retrenched without payment at the time of retrenchment compensation as prescribed therein read with Section 25B(2)."

"What is retrenchment? the key to this vexed question is found in Section 2(oo). The expression "for any reason whatsoever" is very wide and almost admitting of no exception. Still the employer argues that the order of appointment carries with it an automatic cessation of service and the period of employment works itself out by efflux of time not by any act of the employer."

"Section 2(oo) is the master of the situation and the Court cannot truncate its amplitude. "Termination for any reason whatsoever" are the key words. Whatever the reason every termination spells out retrenchment. "A termination is where a term expires either by the active step of the master or the running out of the stipulated term. To protect the weak against the strong, the policy of comprehensive definition has been effectuated. Termination embraces not merely the act of the termination by the employer, but the fact of termination, however, produced. "To write into the order of appointment the date of termination confers no moksha from Section 25F(b) is inferable from the proviso to Section 25F(1). True the Section speaks of retrenchment by the employer and it is urged that some act of violation by the employer to bring about the termination is essential to attract Section 25F and automatic extinguishment of service by efflux of time cannot be sufficient. [Rex Vs. Secretary of State (1973) (2) A.E.A. 103].

So, it is clear that simply because the respondent-management has mentioned in the order, that the appointment is from a particular date to another date, it cannot be contended that there is an automatic cessation of employment on the expiry of the period fixed. The petitioner also relied upon the decision in *BALBIR SINGH Vs. KURUKSHETRA CENTRAL CO-OP. BANK LTD. AND OTHERS* (1990 1-LLJ p. 443) wherein it was held as follows:

"The amended provision of Section 2(oo) (bb) cannot be so construed as to drastically restrict the orbit of the term retrenchment. Clause (bb) is an exception which must be interpreted narrowly. It cannot be given meanings which nullify or curtail the ambit of the principal clause. No doubt the intention of the Parliament in enacting this Clause was to exclude certain categories of workers from the term "retrenchment", but there is nothing in this clause which allows an outlet to unscrupulous employers to shunt out workers in the garb of non-renewal of the contract even when the work subsists. . . . "The contractual clause enshrined in Clause (bb) cannot be resorted to frustrate the claim of employee against uncalled for retrenchment or for denying other benefits. It cannot be so interpreted as

to enable an employer to resort to the policy of "hire and fire" and give unguided power to the employer to renew or not renew the contract irrespective of the circumstances in which it was entered into or the nature and extent of work for which he was employed."

"Clause (bb) has to be so interpreted as to limit it to cases where the work itself has been accomplished and the agreement of hiring for a specific period was genuine. If the work continues, the non-renewal of the contract has to be dubbed, as mala fide."

12. Therefore, from this it is clear that simply because the appointment was for a particular period, it cannot be contended that the employment ceases automatically on the expiry of the said period. As pointed out already, the post is a permanent post, and admittedly there will always be work, yet the respondent has chosen to make periodical appointments for over a period of 2 years. It is not as if the employment was for a special work, or that the said work has been completed. It is evident that the hiring for a specific period was not genuine. The petitioner also relied upon the decision in *JAYABHARAT PRINTERS Vs. LABOUR COURT (Ker)* (82 FJR 622) wherein it was held that the Contractual employment cannot be resorted to frustrate workman's right to benefit of retrenchment and the periodical renewals of contract where a job continues and service is satisfactory is only a camouflage to circumvent benefits of continuous service under the Act. This decision also goes to show that the management cannot under the guise of periodical appointments and renewals circumvent the benefit of continuous service available to the petitioner under the Industrial Disputes Act. The observations at Page 626 of the judgement are very important and are as follows:

"The gaps during which he was out of employment according to Exhibit M-4 series are not very wide. It is not as if at a particular period there was excess work and therefore to meet emergency such a contract employment was made. The nature of the employment and the gaps between the periods would indicate that the conclusion arrived at by the Labour Court that it was a continuous engagement, is reasonable."

In the present case also we find that the gaps during which the petitioner was out of employment is either NIL or very negligible. Here also it is not as if there was a particular work and there was an emergency to meet a particular type of excess work. The evidence of MW1 shows that the post is permanent and there will always be work. The observations at Page 627 of the above said decision are as follows:

"The nature of employment will have to be determined with reference to the nature of duties performed by the workman and the type of job the workman was entrusted with. If the workman is engaged to do a particular job which may require him to do actual work for more than 240 days in twelve calendar months, such employment would be covered by the amended sub-clause because the employment comes to an end with the completion of the work. A stipulation in the contract that the employment would be for a specific period or till completion of work may also fall within the scope and ambit of this sub-clause. But, if the employer resorts to contractual employment as a device to simply take it out of the principal clause (oo) irrespective of the fact that the work continues or the nature of duties which the workman was performing are still in existence, such contractual engagements will have to be tested on the anvil of fairness, propriety and bona fides. May be that such fixed tenure employments are made to frustrate the claim of the workman to become regular or get himself confirmed as a permanent employee either under the rules applicable to such employment or even under the Standing Orders. It is always open to the Court adjudicating the dispute to examine each and every case in its proper perspective and to protect the workman against the abuse of amended provision. If this protection is not afforded the benefit flowing from retrenchment, to which every termination succumbs would be rendered nugatory. The amended sub-clause (bb) would apply only to such case where the work ceases with the employment or the post itself ceases to exist or such other analogous cases where the

contract of employment is found to be fair proper and bona fide."

This decision clearly goes to support the case of the petitioner in the circumstances pointed out by me above.

13. The petitioner also relied upon the decision in *D.H. SHIRKE AND OTHERS Vs. ZILLA PARISHAD, YAVATMAL AND OTHERS* (1990 I-LJJ p. 445) wherein it was held that the letter of appointment providing fixed tenure cannot be the sole basis to determine whether the sub-clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) is attracted. Nature of employment, nature of duties and type of job should be considered. It was also held that the amended sub-clause (bb) would apply only to cases where work ceases with employment or the post itself ceases to exist or such other analogous cases where contract of employment is fair, proper and bona fide. It was also held that the Labour Court has jurisdiction to examine each and every case and protect the workman against exploiting employers. At page 448, we find the following observations:

"To make appointments for specific periods did not absolve the Management from complying with the conditions stipulated under Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act at the time the period of employment comes to an end. The benefit of law laid down by the Supreme Court was extended to all the workmen, even to those who were employed for specific work, or for a particular job and even to casual labourers who were engaged merely to complete casual nature of work....." "It needs no further explanation but the probability of the employer exploiting the labour by giving fixed tenure appointments can never be overruled and therefore it would be improper and unwise simply to decide the nature of employment on the basis of letter of appointment issued by the employer. The nature of employment will have to be determined with reference to the nature of duties performed by the workman and the type of job, workman was entrusted with."

14. It is evident that in the present case, the Clerk-cum-Typist post which the petitioner was occupying is a permanent post and that there will always be work. There is nothing to show that the employment is for a specific purpose or for the performance of a specific work. MW1 admitted that there will always be work. So, in such circumstances when the respondent has chosen to issue periodical appointment orders containing the date of expiry also, it cannot be stated that such employment comes under Section 2(oo)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act where under on expiry of contractual period the employment will come to an end. Where the work is continuous, and the employment, for no valid reason, is made temporarily for specific periods, and when the nature of the work is such that it will continue always, then it is clear that the action of the respondent is mala fide and is only intended to prevent worker from getting confirmation and permanency.

15. The learned counsel for the respondent on the other hand relied upon the decision in *CROMPTON ENGINEERING CO. Vs. ADDITIONAL LABOUR COURT* (1975 I-LJJ p. 207) wherein it was held that the casual or temporary employees, on the termination of service on the expiry of the period for which they were employed, cannot contend that they should be given work again by the employer. But, we find that this decision relates to a case where the appointment orders were issued in respect of a particular contract or for particular period and their appointments were purely temporary and came to an end as soon as the period or job was over. There was also evidence to show that the contract for which the workmen were employed was over, and that the Company had got other contract for which service of these workmen were not immediately needed. Therefore, the Labour Court accepted the position that the workmen were employed for a particular contract and after the completion of the contract, even when the petitioner took some other contract, the services of the workmen were not needed. Therefore, it was held that the workmen were not entitled to reinstatement. So, this decision will not help the respondent. The respondent also relied upon the decision in *Prakash Cotton Mills Pvt. Ltd. vs. The Rashtriya Mill Mazdoor Sangh* (1987 I-LJJ p. 97) wherein it was held that Badli workmen have no right to claim compensation on account of closure. That decision also cannot help the respondent here because we are not concerned with the

case of closure. Further, Section 25-F relating to the condition precedent to retrench a workman does not except a Badli or a casual, whereas Section 35-C excepts a badli or a casual worker while conferring the right on a workman to receive compensation. Therefore, also this decision will not help the respondent. The learned counsel for the respondent relied upon the decision in State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Kaushal Kishore Shukla (78 FJR p 441) wherein it was held that the services of a temporary employee can be terminated if he is found unsuitable for service and when the conduct of the workman was also unsatisfactory or continuance in service is not in public interest. In this decision it has been held that a temporary government servant has no right to hold the post and his services are liable to be terminated by giving one month's notice without assigning any reason either under the terms of the contract providing for such termination or under the relevant statutory rules regulating the terms and conditions of temporary government service. But, the decisions cited by the petitioner and extracted above clearly go to show that when the appointments are made periodically with the intent to prevent the workman from getting the benefit of retrenchment or getting confirmed then such an appointment cannot be held to come under the provisions of Section 2(oo) (bb) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Further, even in the case relied upon by the respondent, it has been held that the services of the temporary government can be terminated by issuing a month's notice. In the present case, no such notice has been given to the petitioner. So, this case relied upon by the respondent does not help the respondent. It is evident that the petitioner has worked for more than 480 days during a period of 24 months prior to the termination of his service. Under Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, the petitioner's services are to be made permanent. Of course, the learned counsel for the respondent contended that the provisions of the Act will only apply to an industrial establishment where there are more than 50 persons. But under G.O. Ms. No. 2043 Labour and Employment dated 24-9-82, the provisions of this Act have been made applicable to an industrial establishment in which there are not less than 20 workers employed at any day. It is not contended that there are less than 20 employees in the respondent. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to reinstatement and to be made permanent in as much the termination of his services amounts to retrenchment and since no notice has been given or compensation has been paid.

16. The next contention of the respondent is that the petitioner is estopped from claiming that he should be made permanent because the respondent conducted a test and interview for this post, and the petitioner applied for appointment to this post and also appeared for the interview, but was unsuccessful. But, admittedly his juniors were selected and the petitioner was not selected on the ground that he had secured less marks in the interview. Therefore, the respondent contends that the petitioner having applied for the post, appeared for the test and the interview, and having failed to qualify himself for appointment, is estopped from claiming the right to be appointed in the permanent post, such a contention cannot be accepted there cannot be an estoppel against the provisions of a statute viz., Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981. So, this contention of the respondent cannot be accepted.

17. The learned counsel for the petitioner relying upon the decision in Mohinder Sen Garg Vs. State of Punjab (1991) I-SSC p. 662, and the decision in Munindra Kumar Vs. Rajiv Govil (AIR 1991 SC p. 1607) contended that the management cannot fix more than 15 per cent of the marks for the interview whereas, in the present case, the respondent had fixed, 100 marks for the Typewriting test, 100 marks for English, and General knowledge and 100 marks for interview. The learned counsel for the petitioner points out to Exhibits M-2 and M-3 in this regard and contends that while the petitioner has secured high marks in the typewriting test and written test, has been given low marks in the interview, while two of his juniors K. Vignanesan and C. Indra who were selected and who were given higher marks in the interview than the petitioner. The maximum interview mark was also 100, while for the written test and typewriting test also the maximum mark was 100 each. The learned

counsel for the petitioner contended that this is not proper. But, the learned counsel for the respondent contended that the cases relied upon by the petitioner were cases where the very selection on the basis of fixing high interview mark was questioned in writ proceedings, whereas this Tribunal cannot question those aspects in a case under Industrial Disputes Act. Whatever it is, it is evident that the action of the respondent in fixing a high mark for interview at more than 15 per cent of total marks goes to show the malafide on the part of the respondent.

18. One other contention put forward by the respondent is that while, the prescribed educational qualification for the post of clerk-cum-Typist was a second class degree, the petitioner has got only a third class degree and therefore he cannot be stated to be qualified. But, it is evident that the petitioner has been working for more than 2 years under the respondent as clerk-cum-Typist. There is nothing to show that his services were found to be unsatisfactory. The evidence also shows that he was employed temporarily even after the interview etc. When the qualification is fixed as a second class degree, the respondent thought it fit to permit the petitioner to appear for the test and also to appear for the interview, though the petitioner is only a third class graduate. The respondent did not prevent him or debar him from appearing for the interview on the ground that he is only a 3rd class graduate. Therefore, the respondent cannot now say that the petitioner was not educationally qualified. The learned counsel for the petitioner also relied upon the decision in Bhagwati Prasad Vs. D. S. M. DEVT. CORPN. (1990) I-LLJ p. 320 at p. 322) where in it was held that 'practical experience would always aid the person effectively discharge the duties and is a sure guide to assess the suitability. The initial minimum educational qualification prescribed for the different posts is undoubtedly a factor to be reckoned with, but it is so at the time of the initial entry into the service. Once the appointments were made as daily rated workers and they were allowed to work for a considerable length of time, it would be hard and harsh to deny them confirmation in the respective posts on the ground that they lack the prescribed educational qualifications. In our view, three years experience ignoring artificial break in service for short period periods created by the respondent, in the circumstances would be sufficient for confirmation.' This decision clearly goes to support the contention of the petitioner that after having appointed the petitioner for such a long time to work as a clerk-cum-Typist in spite of the fact that the respondent knew that he was only a 3rd class graduate, and when there is nothing to show that his service was not satisfactory, the respondent cannot contend that the petitioner is not entitled to be appointed permanently since he does not possess a second class degree.

19. So, taking into consideration all these facts, I find that periodical appointments of the petitioner did not automatically come to an end at the period, and that the termination of the services of the petitioner amounts to retrenchment. I also find that it is not legal and valid, since no notice has been given to him and no compensation has been paid to him. I also find that the petitioner has worked for more than 480 days within the period of 24 calendar months prior to the termination of the services, and that he is entitled to be made permanent. I also find that the petitioner cannot be denied permanency on the ground that he does not possess a second class degree; and that he is not also estopped from claiming the right to become a permanent employee in view of his failure to qualify in the test/interview. Therefore, I find that the petitioner is entitled to be reinstated into service on permanent basis with back wages from the date of termination of his service.

20. In the result, an award is passed holding that the termination of the services of the petitioner P. Muralidharan, Clerk-cum-Typist is not justified. The petitioner is entitled to be reinstated into service on a permanent basis from the date of termination with back wages. No costs.

Dated, this the 16th day of March, 1994

THIRU K. SAMPATH KUMAR, Industrial Tribunal
WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Workmen :

W.W. 1 : Thiru P. Muralidharan,

For Management :

M.W. 1 : Thiru G. Thangapandit.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Workmen :

- Ex. W-1 : Table showing the periods work done by the petitioner workman Thiru P. Muralidharan and the date of termination orders issued to him (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-2/11-11-87 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-3/23-11-87 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 30-12-87 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-4/18-1-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 29-1-88 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-5/1-3-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 31-3-88 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-6/1-6-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 30-6-88 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-7/4-7-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 3-8-88 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-8/5-8-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the post of Clerk-cum-Typist (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-9/7-9-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 5-10-1988 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-10/7-10-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 7-11-88 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-11/9-11-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 8-12-88 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-12/12-12-88 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 11-1-89 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-13/16-1-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 15-2-89 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-14/17-2-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 16-3-89 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-15/20-3-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 19-4-89 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-16/21-4-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 20-5-89 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-17/23-5-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 22-6-89 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-18/26-6-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 25-7-89 (Xerox copy).

Ex. W-19/27-7-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 25-8-89 (Xerox copy).

Ex. W-20/31-8-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 29-9-89 (Xerox copy).

Ex. W-21/4-10-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 3-11-89 (Xerox copy).

Ex. W-22/7-11-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 6-12-89 (Xerox copy).

Ex. W-23/8-12-89 : Appointment order issued to the Petitioner-workman for the Post of Clerk-cum-Typist and the order of discontinuation dated 5-1-90 (Xerox copy).

Ex. W-24/2-12-88 : Letter from Respondent-Management to the Petitioner-workman calling for tests (Xerox copy).

Ex. W. 25/7-10-89 : Letter from Respondent-Management to the Petitioner-workman calling for interview (Xerox copy).

For Management :

Ex. M. 1 : List of candidates called for Typewriting test (Xerox copy).

Ex. M-2 : Results of the Typewriting examination held on 10-12-88 (Xerox copy).

Ex. M. 3/16-10-89 : Statement showing the names of candidates (including the petitioner-workman and their marks (Xerox copy)

Ex. M-4/series : Xerox copies of attendance register for the months of October 1989, December 1989, and January, 1990.

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1994

का.अ. 1959.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्तर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार केनरा बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के सबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अन्तर्बंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 2, बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/259/92-आई.आर.बी. - 2]

बी.के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1994

S.O. 1959.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Canara Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-7-1994.

[No. L-12012/259/92-IR (B-IF)]
V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

CAMP : PUNE

PRESENT :

Shri S. B. Panse, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/65 of 1992

Employers in relation to the management of Canara
Bank

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. E. Anantha Rao, Senior
Manager.

For the Workmen—No appearance.

INDUSTRY : Banking STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 4th July, 1994

AWARD

The Central Government by its Order No. L-12012/259/92-IR (B-II) dated 8-12-92 have referred the dispute under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication.

2. The Reference relates to action of the management against one peon of the Canara Bank. It states :

"Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank in relation to its Pune Camp Branch in terminating the employment of Shri Ashok Patole, Peon, is justified ? If not, what is the relief to which the workman is entitled ?"

3. After receipt of the said Reference notices were issued to concerned parties. Mr. Patole was served with the notice and acknowledgement received dated 2-2-93 is on record. Then again a notice was issued to him and the acknowledgement dated 3-3-93 appears to have been signed by him. The Bank appeared through its advocate. The venue then was at Bombay. There the claimant Patole viz. the workman did not appear but the Bank represented its side.

4. The Tribunal then decided to have sitting at Pune for the convenience of the Union, workers and the management at Pune and in nearby area. It is thus again a registered notice was sent to Ashok Patole. One such envelope which is on the record discloses that he did not claim the envelope. There is another envelope with the same endorsement and a third envelope has an endorsement of the Refusal. So far as the Divisional Manager of the Canara Bank, the Employer concerned, it represented itself at Pune also.

5. From perusal of the record which I have discussed above it is crystal clear that the workman Shri Patole of the Canara Bank for the reasons known to him does not want to proceed with the matter. I do not want any justification for adjourning the matter suo moto in the result I pass the following Award.

AWARD

The Reference is disposed of as no claim is set forth by the workman Patole against the Canara Bank.

No order as to costs.

S. B. PANSE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1994

का.प्र. 1960.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ महाराष्ट्रा के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में निम्नलिखित

जौर उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. 2, बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/318/92-आर. प्रार. बी.-2]

बी. के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1994

S.O. 1960.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Maharashtra and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-7-1994.

[No. L-12012/318/92-IR (B-II)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

CAMP : PUNE

PRESENT :

Shri S. B. Panse, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/25 of 1993

Employers in relation to the Management of Bank of
Maharashtra

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—(1) Shri R. G. Londhe, Deputy Chief
Manager(2) Shri R. M. Samudra, Deputy
Chief ManagerFor the Workmen—Shri V. D. Karmarkar, General
Secretary

INDUSTRY : Banking STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 4th July, 1994

AWARD

The Central Government by its Order No. L-12012/318/92-IR (B-II) dated 12-3-93 have referred the following Industrial Disputes to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of Maharashtra in relation to its Bajirao Road Branch in assigning duties of exchange of notes and coins along with receipt and payment to Shri A. M. Badekar teller vide management's office order No. AY1/ESTB/91/13-2-91 is justified ? If not, what is the relief to which the workmen is entitled to ?"

2. After receipt of the Reference the parties were served. They were directed to file their submissions in the matter. They received the notices. The workman and the employer appeared through their respective representatives.

3. Today the matter was for filing the statement of claim by the workman. Instead of filing the Claim Statement the General Secretary filed a purshis mentioning that at present the management is willing to discuss various disputes in general and those pending before various labour authorities and Tribunals through mutual discussion. Under such circumstances the Union which is party to the present Reference prays :

"Without prejudice to the Union's principles and in the instant matter the Union is willing to treat this dispute as closed."

It is further submitted that the Reference also be treated as closed. The General Secretary of the Union is present before the Tribunal. The employer viz. the Bank of Maharashtra has no objection for such a closure.

4. It is always to be seen in such disputes that they should be mutually settled. The step taken by the Union is to be accepted which I do and pass the following Award.

AWARD

The Reference is disposed of for want of prosecution.
No orders as to costs.

S. B. PANSE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1994

का.प्र. 1961.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दक्षिण रेलवे, मद्रास के प्रबन्धसंसद के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवादों में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचपद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-41012/76/92-आई आर (जी यू) बी-1]
बी.के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1994

S.O. 1961.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Southern Railway, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-7-1994.

[No. L-41012/76/92-IR (DU)/B-I]
V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU
MADRAS

Friday, the 27th day of May, 1994

PRESENT :

Thiru K. Sampath Kumaraa, B.A., B.L., Industrial Tribunal.

Industrial Dispute No. 106/93

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workman and the Management of Southern Railway, Madras)

BETWEEN

Shri D. Mani,
No. 9, Bajanai, Koil Street,
Gribilapet, Palanipet Post,
Arakonam-631002.

AND

The General Manager,
Southern Railway,
Madras-600003.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-41012/76/92-IR (DU), dated 10-11-1993,
Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal upon perusing the reference, claim statement, and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Tvl. G. S. Hiriyanna and S. Nandakumar, Advocates appearing

for the Workman, and the Management being absent, this Tribunal passed the following :

AWARD

This reference has been made for the adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the action of the Management of Southern Railway is justified in removing Shri D. Mani, Pointsman 'B' from service with effect from 10-2-1977 ? If not to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?"

2. The allegation in the claim statement are as follows.—
The petitioner was appointed as Casual Labourer during 1962, promoted as Leave Reserve porter in 1964, and thereafter as pointsman 'B'. From 10-2-77, the petitioner was removed from service by the Divisional Safety Officer under the penalty advice No. M/P 227/1/MT 693 dated 3-2-77. He was served with a memorandum dated 30-10-75 alleging that he abstained from duty from 7-8-75 to 18-9-75 and from 23-9-75 without authority and thus committed misconduct. The petitioner submitted his explanation dated 13-1-76 stating that he was sick and underwent treatment in the Government Hospital at Thiruthani, and could not inform the authorities as he had no male members in his house to help him. The charge memo dated 30-10-75 was accordingly issued to him. The petitioner produced the medical certificate to the Yard Master and was directed to the Assistant Medical Officer, Arakonam for examination, who examined and issued the fitness certificate to the petitioner based on which the Yard Master took the applicant for duty from 16-9-75. But, again the petitioner fell ill and underwent treatment from the same Government doctor, Thiruthani from 23-9-75. After recovery the petitioner reported for duty to the Yard Master on 9-12-75. The Yard Master sent him to see the Divisional Safety Officer by giving emergent duty pass dated 11-12-75. Thereafter he was tossed from pillar to post and that was treated as absence. The petitioner had not absented at any stage want only. The Enquiry Officer conducted the enquiry without giving the documents relied upon by the administration and the petitioner was coerced for cross-examination even though he did not offer himself for cross-examination. The enquiry was not held in conformity with the D&A Rules 1968. The petitioner was denied of a reasonable opportunity to prove his innocence. The Disciplinary Authority had not applied his mind to the documents, and accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer, he imposed the penalty of removal from service, and communicated the same through his letter dated 3-2-77 with effect from 10-2-77. On the petitioner's appeal on 19-3-77 to the Divisional Superintendent against the order of the Disciplinary Authority, the penalty was confirmed. The petitioner filed a revision petition dated 9-9-78 to the General Manager and no reply has been received. He was sick during the period and was accused of having abstained from duty without proper authority. He had submitted medical certificate to the office and had reported back for the duty to the Yard Master on 9-12-75. The petitioner pursued his attempts reinstatement by representation through Union and the Member of Parliament upto the level of the Railway Minister. The Welfare Inspector came to Arakonam and made a detailed investigation. The petitioner was pursuing the matter diligently till 6-6-90, but no orders were received. The petitioner sent another representation for which the Divisional Railway Manager replied that it was not possible to reinstate him. The petitioner approached the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal in M.P. 51/90 and petitioner was directed to exhaust the remedy before the machinery provided under Industrial Disputes Act. The charge sheet is not clear. The enquiry was not conducted according to the procedure. No witness was examined and no documents were marked. But, the petitioner was cross-examined even though he did not offer himself for cross-examination. The Disciplinary Authority did not apply its mind. The petitioner was removed by a person who had no competence. Therefore, an award may be passed holding that the action of the Divisional Safety Officer and Divisional Superintendent in removing him from service with effect from 10-2-77 is not legal and justified, and directing the respondent to reinstate him into service with continuity of service with back wages and other attendant benefits.

3. The respondent remains absent and has been set aside.

4. The issues that arise for consideration are :

1. Whether there has been a proper and just enquiry against the petitioner ?
2. Whether the charges against the petitioner have been proved ?

5. Issues 1 and 2—The petitioner examined himself as WW-1 and stated that from 7-8-75 to 15-9-75 he was ill and was admitted as an inpatient in the Government Hospital, Thiruthani, that he joined duty and worked from 16-9-75 to 22-9-75 and that he once again was ill from 23-9-75 till 8-12-75. He also stated that the medical certificate issued by the hospital was given by him to the railway hospital, and the railway hospital issued him certificate enabling him to join duty. He has filed Ex. W-1, a certificate issued by the Yard Master permitting him to join duty from 16-9-75. If really he was not sick and if his absence was not due to a bonafide reason, he would not have been permitted to join duty on 16-9-75. WW-1 stated that once again he fell ill and after being hospitalised, he joined duty on 9-12-75, that at that time also he got a certificate from Government Hospital, Thiruthani and gave it to the railway hospital, that on the certificate issued by the railway hospital, he was permitted to join duty on 9-12-75. He further stated that on 11-12-75 he was informed that the Divisional Safety Officer had summoned him and therefore, was issued a duty pass for that purpose. This duty pass has been marked as Ex. W-2. It shows that he was authorised to travel from Arakonam to Madras and back between 11-12-75 and 13-12-75. WW-1 stated that he went to Madras met the Divisional Safety Officer, who sent him back asking to come after a week, but when he went to duty on 12-12-75, they refused to allow him for duty without orders from Divisional Safety Officer. He stated that no charge memo was issued to him, that no witness was examined, that no documents were given but he received orders dismissing him from service on 10-2-77 (Ex. W-3). He also stated that the appeal filed by him was dismissed (Ex. W-4). He stated that he thereafter gave representations under Exs. W-5 to W-7, that the Railway Welfare Inspector came to his house and gave a letter Ex. W-8 taking some documents from him. He also stated that he filed a revision petition under Ex. W-9, for which there was no reply. WW-1 also stated that he filed a petition before Central Administrative Tribunal wherein he was directed to approach the Industrial Tribunal. Then, he approached the Conciliation Officer, and the Conciliation failure report has been marked as Ex. M-11. He also stated that he was a permanent employee even since 1962.

6. The petitioner also examined WW-2, the then Yard Master of Arakonam from 1975 to 1978, who stated in his evidence that the petitioner was working under him as Pointsman, that even if a person handover a certificate from the Government hospital, he will not be allowed to duty unless a fitness certificate is obtained from Railway hospital, that the railway hospital issued fitness certificate to the petitioner, and therefore, he was permitted to attend to duty. He also stated that the permission given by him to the petitioner to join duty is Ex. W-1. WW-2 stated once again on 9-12-75 also the petitioner produced a certificate from the Government hospital, that at the time also he was Petitioner to join duty is Ex. W-1. WW-2 stated once again from railway hospital. He also stated that on 11-12-75 on information received by phone, he issued a duty pass Ex. W-2 and sent him to Madras. He also stated that thereafter he did not allow the petitioner to duty stating that he will be permitted to join duty only if he received orders from the Divisional Safety Officer. There is no evidence contrary to that of the petitioner. His evidence shows that there was no proper enquiry against him. There is nothing to prove the charges against him. The respondent remains ex parte and has not taken part in this enquiry. Therefore, I find that the order removing the petitioner from service has to be set aside.

In the result, I find that the removal of the petitioner D. Mani from service is not justified, and the same is set aside. The respondent is directed to reinstate the petitioner into service with continuity of service, back wages and other attendant benefits. Award is passed accordingly. No costs.

Dated, this the 27th day of May, 1994.

THIRU K. SAMPATH KUMARAN, Industrial Tribunal

1774 GI/94—12

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Workman :

WW-1—Thiru D. Mani.
WW-2—Samuel Jesudoss.

For Management :
None.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Workman :

- Ex. W-1/16-9-75—Duty Certificate issued by Yard Master to Petitioner-Worker Thiru D. Mani.
- Ex. W-2/11-12-75—Emergent Duty Pass issued to Petitioner-worker.
- Ex. W-3/3-2-77—Removal order issued to Petitioner-Worker.
- Ex. W-4/18-11-77—Order of Appellate Authority.
- Ex. W-5/ —Letter from Petitioner-workman to the Hon'ble Minister for Railway, New Delhi (copy).
- Ex. W-6/30-10-86—Representation to the Hon'ble Minister for Railways, New Delhi by Working President, All India Iniraji SC/ST Welfare Federation, Arakonam, regarding removal from service of Petitioner-Worker (copy).
- Ex. W-7/8-12-86—Representation through Member of Parliament to the Minister of State for Railways, New Delhi.
- Ex. W-8/8-11-86—The list of documents written by Welfare Inspector.
- Ex. W-9/9-9-78—Revision petition of Petitioner-worker addressed to the General Manager, Southern Railway, Madras-3.
- Ex. W-10/12-3-91—Order of Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras in Misc. Petition No. 451/90 (Xerox copy).
- Ex. W-11/26-5-92—Conciliation failure Report (Xerox copy).

For Management :

NIL.

मई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1994

का.अ.० 1962.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 1, बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-17011/105/90-आई०आर(बी-2)]

बी०के० शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1994

S.O. 1962.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay as shown in the Annexur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of L.I.C. of India and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-1994.

[No. L-17011/105/90-IR (B-II)
V. K. SHARMA, Desk Office

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-9 of 1991

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management Life Insurance
Corporation of India.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management—Miss Ajwani.

For the Workmen—Shri A. S. Deo.

INDUSTRY : Insurance

STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 6th July, 1994

AWARD

Government of India, Ministry of Labour by letter dated 18-2-1991 made following reference to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) read with 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the action of the management of LIC in denying the out of pocket expenses to Class III and Class IV workmen who have to visit other offices and branches is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

2. Statement of claim filed on behalf of their Association and written statement filed by the Corporation gives the nature of controversy giving rise to this reference. The point in fact is whether the Class III and Class IV employees should be provided out of pocket expenses when they are required to go out for official work and be away from their usual place of work and miss lunch hour and should be compensated as is being done in the case of officers who visit local Courts and have to spend considerable time outside the office as well as Class III and Class IV employees who have to visit local Courts.

3. The Association has in the statement of claim enumerated the circumstances under which such allowance is paid to the officers as well as Class III and Class IV employees working in the legal department attending Courts or offices of solicitors/advocates/counsel. The grievance is that such facility is not extended to the employees of other departments who are also required to be away from the usual place of work and visit offices as a part of their duties and are required to skip lunch hour and are not able to avail of lunch at the prescribed hours. The negotiations and attempts of conciliation have failed. The reference has come to be made.

4. The management has admitted that such allowance is being paid to Class I Officers at the rate of Rs. 25, to the Clerical employees at the rate of Rs. 15 and Sub-ordinate Staff at the rate of Rs. 10 when they have to attend to proceedings in a court and unable to return to the office before 2 p.m. So far as the officers are concerned it has been done by the circular dated 30-1-1986 and with regard to Class III and Class IV employees it has been done by subsequent circular dated 9-1-1986. Besides circular (copies thereof) are Annexure 'A' and 'B' to the written statement, Shri Nanal has filed an affidavit on behalf of the Association and written arguments have been filed on either side. I also heard oral submissions.

5. The demands of the employees which have been supported by Employees Association is made on the basis of the allowance granted to the officers and Class III and Class IV employees of the legal department of the Corporation. If one has a look out at circulars issued and which are Annexures 'A' and 'B' it will be obvious that the subject is "out of pocket expenses to the officers who have to visit local courts" and "out of pocket expenses of Class III and Class

IV employees who have to visit local courts". After having issued circular dated 30-1-1986 which took into account the fact that the officers who have to visit local courts and have to spend considering time out side their office were not paid any out of pocket expenses and considering the fact that they would not be in office during the lunch time and have many times to reach court/counsel/solicitors earlier than the office time decision to allow a consolidated amount of Rs. 25 per day for out of pocket expenses was taken. Those allowances were to be paid to the officers in the cadre AAO, AO and ADM only at all centres subject to the condition that they are detained outside office upto 2.00 p.m. This payment is expected to be sanctioned by an Officer not below the rank of DM duly authorised by the Head of the Office. On similar lines is the circular dated 9-9-1986 which ofcourse covers the category of Class III and Class IV employees who are sanctioned the allowance of Rs. 15 and Rs. 10 respectively. Shri Nanal, in his affidavit stated that this is a case of discrimination without a justification between employees required to attend court and those required to attend other offices and branches under similar circumstances. It is the grievance of the Employees' Association that the other conditions remaining constant the employees other than those who are required to attend court also be paid on the same lines as the employees required to attend court and offices of advocates/solicitors/counsel.

6. I am unable to see any justification for the action of the management in not extending this facility to the employees who are required to leave the place of work for official purposes and are required to be away till 2.00 p.m. in that connection and not compensated. I could not get any satisfactory explanation much less justification for this. It was submitted that the employees required to attend courts are unable to leave courts because of the fixed court's working hours. I do not see how that could be urged by way of justification. Conditions under which Officers and the Class III and Class IV employees are entitled to the allowance are set out in Annexure 'A' as well as Annexure 'B'. The condition is that they are detained outside office upto 2.00 p.m. Further conditions, payment is sanctioned by the Officer not below the rank of DM duly authorised by the Head of the Office. These very conditions are applicable to the Class III and Class IV employees. These very conditions could be applied to the other Class III and Class IV employees who are not covered by Annexure 'B' circular, namely, who are not required to visit local courts but other offices.

7. Decision in the case between Atic Industries Ltd. and others and its workmen and others, in the Supreme Court of India, Civil Appeals Nos. 742, 809 and 2086 of 1968, dated 14 March 1972, has been referred to and relied upon. It is held therein that in a proper case, the Industrial Tribunal can impose new obligations on the employer in the interest of social justice and can also involve the parties in a new Contract. It is further observed that an Industrial Tribunal has jurisdiction to make a proper and reasonable order in any industrial dispute. It should be borne in mind that the foundation of the principle of industry-cum-region is that as far as possible there should be uniformity of conditions of service in comparable concerns with the industry in the region so that there is no imbalance in the conditions of service between workmen. Here in this case there is no uniformity in the different departments and it is only those who are required to attend courts and offices of advocates/solicitors/counsel who are provided that allowance, if they are unable to get back to their office before 2.00 p.m. In respect of the rest of the Officers and Class III and Class IV employees there is no such payment of allowance even though they have to be away from their place of work and unable to return till 2.00 p.m. The contention of the Corporation that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such grievance and give relief is in my opinion misconceived as seen from the above quoted judgement of the Supreme Court that the Tribunal is vested with the jurisdiction to deal with and adjudicate upon such a dispute. Therein that case was the question about payment of transport allowance. Here the point is with regard to the payment of out of pocket expenses incurred by the workmen. I have therefore, no hesitation in holding that this invidious distinction between those required to attend courts and those required to be out of their offices for discharging official duties has to be done away with and the management of the Corporation will have to treat all those on the same footing as has been done by circular dated 9-9-1986. Annexure 'B'. This of

course, subject to the same conditions laid down by that circular, read with circular dated 30th January 1986.

8. It is submitted that the amount of allowance is fixed in the year 1986 and is required to be suitably raised in view of the rise in cost of living index and value of the rupee going down. I do not think in this reference, I should deal with this aspect of the matter. As and when this circular dated 30-1-1986 and 9-9-1986 is suitably amended the employees who are covered by this reference would also be given the benefit.

9. The prayer is that the allowance should be payable with effect from 1-1-1986. It is further difficult to give effect to this direction with retrospective effect, that is January 1986. I can not grant that prayer for various reasons. To sum up, I direct that the Class III and Class IV employees should also be given the benefit of circular dated 9-9-1986 without restricting the out of pocket allowance (lunch allowance) to only those who visit local courts.

10. Award accordingly.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1994

कां० 1963.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ मद्रुरा लि०, मद्रुराई के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रुरास के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/72/84-डी. IV/ए/आ. आर. बी. ई./आई
बी०के० शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1994

S.O. 1963.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Madura Ltd., Madurai and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19-7-94.

[No. L-12012/72/84-D.IV.A./IRB.I]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU,
MADRAS

Tuesday, the 5th day of April, 1994

PRESENT:

Thiru K. Sampath Kumarn, B.A.B.L., Industrial Tribunal.
Industrial Dispute No. 79/1985

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workman and the Management of Bank of Madura Ltd., Madurai.)

BETWEEN

1. Thiru A. Boomibalagan—(Deceased).
2. Smt. B. Meenambal, Wife of the deceased worker A. Boomibalagan, No. 6/14, Simmakal, Madurai-625001.
3. Miss B. Jeeva, aged 10 years, daughter, No. 6/14, Simmakal, Madurai-625001.
4. Master B. Ganesh, aged 8 years, Son, 6/14, Simmakal, Madurai-625001.

(Legal heirs of the deceased. Nos. 2 to 4 were brought on record as per order of this Tribunal) (in Misc. Appn. No. 121/87, dated 12-8-88).

AND

The Chairman,
Bank of Madura Ltd.,
758, Anna Salai,
Madras-600002.

REFERENCE:

Order No. L-12012/72/84-D.IV(A), dated 13-11-1985, Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on the 25th day of January, 1994, upon perusing the reference Claim and Counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru N.G.R. Prasad for Tvl. Row and Reddy, Advocates appearing for Petitioners 2 to 4, the 1st petitioner having died and of Thiru S. Jayaraman, Advocate appearing for the Management, and this dispute having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following:

AWARD

The reference has been made for the adjudication of the following issue:

"Whether the action of the Management of Bank of Madura Ltd., Madurai in dismissing Shri A. Boomibalagan, Clerk w.e.f. 25-9-82 is justified. If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled."

The petitioner Boomibalagan while he was alive filed the Claim Statement. Subsequent to his death, his legal representatives who have been impleaded as petitioners 2 to 4 have filed an additional Claim Statement.

3. The allegations in the Claim Statement filed by the first petitioner Boomibalagan are as follows:

4. The petitioner was employed as a Clerk on the Bank of Madura Ltd., Madurai and had an unblemished service of 9 years in the Bank. The incident on the basis of which the charge sheet was issued related to 4th March, 1980. At that time, the petitioner was working as at Cashier. On that day certain drafts were issued by the bank out of which one was not entered in the relevant register. Due to this, there was discrepancy in the cash left with the cashier, at the end of the day and an excess amount was noticed. This was later tallied at the applicant's instance with reference to his immediate Officer who also had not made the necessary entry in the scroll book. The petitioner had also not entered the receipt in the cash book. Later when the petitioner represented on the same day about the excess cash in hand the officer remembered having issued a draft for the said amount namely Rs. 722.40, at the close of the banking hours (1.55 p.m.). Hence at the end of the day after the books were tallied necessary corrections were made in the cash book and the scroll book. The incident seems to have been reported by the Officer to the Manager on the next day. The Manager called the petitioner and asked him about it. The petitioner explained that at the last moment of the banking hours, M/s. Dear Automobiles wanted to purchase a draft urgently, that he issued necessary challan on the basis of which the draft was issued by the Bank and that since lunch hour was approaching he thought he would make the entries in the cash book later, but forgot about it after lunch. He said he had no intention of suppressing the cash and that is why he reported about the excess cash in hand immediately the same day to his immediate Superior Officer—Smt. Yasodhara who had signed the draft without making necessary entries in the scroll book. After lapse of more than a year, the charge sheet dated 23-7-81 was issued to the petitioner on the basis of a preliminary report submitted by the Area Manager concerned. According to the charge sheet (i) the applicant had acted in a bad faith, with gross negligence, likely to involve the bank in serious loss, (ii) the applicant did not report the excess cash to Smt. Yasodhara and that act would amount to an act of dishonesty, prejudicial to the interest of the bank, and (iii) the applicant made contradictory statements to the Area Manager and thus made a false statement, which action amounted to prejudicing the interest of the Bank. The applicant denied all the charges.

In the enquiry, Yasodhara, the Manager of the Branch and the Area Manager were examined by the Management. The petitioner and another employee were also examined. It was brought out by the petitioner that it is not as if he alone was responsible for any lapse that had occurred inadvertently in the matter. Yasodhara admitted in her evidence that it was she who was responsible for entering the issue of drafts in the relevant scroll register, and on that particular day, since the draft was required urgently. She signed the same without necessary entry in the scroll register. It was because of this remissness on the part of the Officer that the applicant and the officer were faced with the problem and excess cash which could not be traced to any of the entries either in the cash register or in the scroll register. The Management issued a Show cause notice to the Officer to which she had replied falsely stating that it was she who remembered having issued the draft and after the cash register was tallied for the day, she asked the applicant about the absence of any entry in regard to that draft, upon which the applicant admitted to having noticed excess cash on hand. This has not been noticed by the Enquiry Officer in the Enquiry Report. The enquiry was totally one sided and biased. No proper opportunity was given to the applicant. Unnecessary questions about the applicant's financial position, thereby indicating that he deliberately tried to defraud the bank, were allowed to be put to him. He was not given copies of the preliminary enquiry report given by the Area Manager, and was not allowed to give explanation to that. It was the petitioner who told the officer about the excess cash, upon which she reminded him of the draft issued at the last minute. Both of them made necessary corrections in the cash register and scroll register respectively. The Enquiry Officer has brushed aside the contention of the petitioner that no loss was in fact caused to the bank and therefore, there was no misconduct committed by him. The findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse, and not supported by evidence. The Enquiry Officer should have held that the very fact that not even a show cause notice was issued to the applicant after the incident for more than a year showed that there was really no misconduct on his part. There was no ground for imposing the extreme penalty of dismissal. The punishment imposed is excessive. The past record of the applicant has not been taken into consideration by the Management in imposing the punishment. Therefore, an award may be passed directing the Management to reinstate the petitioner to service with continuity of service, full back wages, and other benefits.

The petitioners 2 to 4 filed the following amended claim statement.—When the Industrial Dispute is pending before this Tribunal, Boomibalan died on 31-5-87. An award may be passed holding that the non-employment of Boomibalan is unjust, that he was entitled reinstatement with continuity of service, full back wages, and the petitioners herein are entitled to corresponding monetary benefits.

6. The respondent filed the following Counter.—On 23-7-81, a charge sheet was issued to the petitioner. On 4-3-1980 the remittance for the draft for Rs. 721.40 had been received by the petitioner at about 2.00 p.m. After affixing the receipt stamp on the DD application, but without entering the same in the scroll book, maintained by him, he forwarded the DD application to the draft section for writing the draft. The draft was prepared and was sent to the Officer as Yasodhara for signature, alongwith DD application. She also omitted to enter the remittance in the scroll book. In the evening when the petitioner cross-verified the total receipts of the scroll book with the receipts of the scroll book maintained by the Officer, both figure tallied, as the said transaction was omitted to be entered in both the books. Taking advantage of the omission of the officer in entering the transaction in the scroll book, the petitioner nurtured the idea of defrauding the bank by secreting the surplus and closed his scroll book and also relevant coin-war register. However, at the time of checking the cash, in the evening, the Officer recollected about the remittance for draft, and when she questioned the petitioner about the non entry in the scroll book, the petitioner readily accepted the surplus cash and changed the entry in the scroll book and coin war register. When reference was made to him by the inspection department of the bank's central office inspection/978/81 dated 12-3-81 the petitioner replied in his letter, dated 16-4-81 that he found out the excess of Rs. 722.40

and when he brought the same to the notice of the Officer, she instructed him to keep the surplus cash separately. The statement given by the petitioner in his letter is not true. If only he had noticed and reported the surplus cash to the officer, he should not have closed the book without accounting for surplus. During the preliminary enquiry conducted by the Area Manager (K. N. Madhavan) in May 80, he admitted before him that what Smt. Yasodhara narrated was correct. The petitioner in order to screen his fraudulent intention and attempted fraud coming to light, changed the version and stated as if he found out the surplus cash and brought it to the notice of the Officer. The preliminary investigation was conducted by the Area Manager before the charge sheet was issued. Letters were sent to both of them on 12-3-81 asking them to give reasons as to how this happened. Yasodhara, by letter dated 6-4-81, stated that the cash received for Rs. 722.40 towards the issue of demand draft had gone directly to the D.D. issue departmental without passing through the scroll, that after the demand draft was written it came to her for her signature that it was little after 2.00 p.m. when everybody was getting out of the seat for lunch, that the purchaser was in a hurry to get the draft signed by the Officer and the Manager before they leave for lunch, and that in a hurry she had signed the demand draft presuming that it would have been written in the scroll already as usual. Only on closing the books, she had remembered the demand draft, signed by her while leaving for lunch. Since the entry was not in the scroll book and cash book, she had asked the cashier about the demand draft, who replied that he had surplus cash by closing the cash on that date despite his trying to tally. He further stated that he did not remember about the demand draft challan which was omitted to be entered. The Officer had stated in that letter that she also informed the petitioner. The Officer regretted for her omission and stated that she did not do it with any wrong intention and that it was only a mistake. The petitioner also replied by his letter wherein he had admitted the mistake, but did not give any reason as to how it had happened.

7. In the enquiry, the petitioner was afforded assistance by a representative by name P. L. Murugappan. The enquiry was conducted according to the principles of natural justice. The petitioner was given all the opportunities. The Management's witness were cross-examined in detail. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report on 31-5-82 holding the petitioner guilty of the charges. The respondent bank concurred with the findings, and having regard to the seriousness of the misconduct, had to terminate the services of the petitioner. He was also afforded an opportunity for appearing before the Chairman for a personal hearing on the proposed punishment. The reply was submitted by the defence representative on behalf of the petitioner. On 23-9-82, the Chairman issued orders dismissing the petitioner from service. The appeal filed by the petitioner was rejected. The dismissal of the petitioner was confirmed by the Board of Directors.

8. If the Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the enquiry conducted by the Management is not fair and proper, an opportunity may be given to the respondent to establish the charges before this Tribunal by letting in evidence.

9. The petitioner has alleged that the charge sheet has been issued after a lapse of one year. The respondent submits that the preliminary enquiry was conducted with a view to give an opportunity to the petitioner, and only after the charge sheet was issued. The contention of the petitioner that the Officer was responsible, and that she had signed the draft without making necessary entry in the scroll cannot be accepted. The allegations that the enquiry was not conducted properly, that the enquiry officer was biased are denied. The allegations that he was not given the preliminary enquiry report, and was not allowed to give an explanation are devoid of merits. The findings of the Enquiry officer are based upon the evidence. The allegation that the punishment is severe and disproportionate, that his past record has not been taken into consideration are bereft of any merits. The petitioner was holding a responsible post and any misconduct committed by an employee holding such a post cannot be viewed leniently. He was working in an organisation which is answerable to the customers. So, the order of dismissal is proper. Therefore, an award may be passed holding that the

termination of the petitioner is justified. There is no warrant to interfere with the punishment.

10. The issue that arise for consideration in this industrial dispute are as follows :

- (1) Whether the respondent has proved the charges against the first petitioner Boomibalagan?
- (2) Whether the punishment of dismissal from service imposed on him is disproportionate and has to be interfered with ?

11. ISSUES Nos. 1 and 2 : The first petitioner was working as a cashier in the respondent's bank at the North Veli Street Branch of Modurai during 1980. On 4-3-1980 a person applied for draft for Rs. 721.40 and paid Rs. 722.40 (Rs. 1/- being the commission). The first petitioner affixed the cash, received stamps on the application for the draft, but had not entered the receipt of the cash in the cash register maintained by him. He had sent the application for preparing the demand draft. Another Clerk by name Thiagarajan (Examined in the domestic enquiry as a witness on by the side of the first petitioner) prepared the demand draft and sent it for the signature of the Officer Yashodhara (MW1 in the domestic enquiry) who also signed it, but, did not enter the same or give a scroll number in the scroll book maintained by her. Therefore, the demand draft was issued without the fact of the cash received for the same being entered in the cashier's (first petitioner) register and also the Officer's register. As is usual the cashier and Officer verified their books in the after lunch session and they talked since both of them had omitted to enter the cash received towards the challan. For the issue of the draft. Then the first petitioner who is the cashier closed the accounts.

12. The respondent contends that in the evening while checking the cash, the Officer Yashodhara remembered about the draft and asked the cashier (1st petitioner) about it, that the first petitioner readily accepted it and stated that he did not remember about it, and stated that he was having surplus cash. The respondent contends that he had closed he accounts already and accordingly altered it by including this sum of Rs. 722.40 towards the draft. The respondent contends that on the next day the Officer Yashodhara reported about this matter to the Branch manager. Then the Area Manager of the bank came and inquired the manager, the Officer Yashodhara and the Cashier (first petitioner). According to the respondent the Officer-Yashodhara narrated the entire incident as detailed above to the Area Manager in the presence of the first petitioner, who also confirmed it. But, the respondent alleged that the first petitioner later on changed his version and stated that it was he who at the first instance informed the Officer about this surplus cash and that the Officer asked him to close the accounts and keep the surplus cash separately.

13. On 15-5-80 the Area Manager sent a report to the Chief Officer, Inspection department of the respondent-bank in this regard (Ex. W-1). The respondent-Management called for the explanation from the Officer Yashodhara and from the first petitioner in this regard on 12-3-81 under Ex. W-2 and W-3. The reply given by the Officer Yashodhara dated 6-4-81 is Ex. W-4, while that given by the first petitioner is Ex. W-5. The Officer-Yashodhara stated that the demand draft application did not go through the scroll maintained by the Officer, that after the preparation of the demand draft it came to her for her signature that it was little after 2.00 p.m. when everybody was getting out of their seats for lunch, that the purchaser was in a hurry to get the draft signed by her and the Manager before they left for lunch, and hence, in a hurry she signed the demand draft presuming that it would have been written in the scroll already as usual. She has also stated that only on closing the books she remembered about the draft, and as the entry was not in the scroll book and cash book, she asked the cashier about, it, and that he admitted about the surplus cash which was found while closing the cash on the day, and that he also stated that despite his trying to tally he did not remember of the draft (omitted to be entered). She has further stated that she told him that he ought to have informed her of the surplus and that he regretted for the omission, that the challan of Rs. 722.40 was entered as the last entry and consequently the closing balance was altered, and the coinwar register also was written afresh.

She has stated that she did not have any wrong intention, and on finding the mistake she had immediately rectified the same on the same day. The first petitioner in his explanation Ex. W-5 stated that when he was balancing the cash, he found the excess of Rs. 722.40, that he brought the same to the notice of the Accountant who instructed him to keep this surplus cash separately, and that the surplus cash was accordingly kept separately. He has also mentioned about the rectification of the mistake in the cash book of himself and the cash scroll maintained by the Officer-Yashodhara. On 23-7-81, the Management issued this charge sheet to the first petitioner detailing about this incident and also stating that he had acted in bad faith with gross negligence likely to involve the bank in serious loss which, if proved, will amount to major misconduct under para 19.5(j) of the Bipartite Settlement. The first petitioner was also charged that his act of not reporting to the Officer concerned about the surplus cash in his and before closing the books and retaining the same with him separately, if proved, will amount to an act of dishonesty and will be an act prejudicial to the interest of the bank as per clause 19.5(j). It is also alleged that the first petitioner at the time of checking of the cash in the evening accepted surplus cash, but, in his explanation dated 16-4-81 (Ex. W-5) he had mentioned that it was he who brought the excess cash to the notice of the Officer and that she instructed him to keep the surplus cash separately. It is also alleged that he admitted before the Area Manager who questioned him, and stated that what all the Officer-Yashodhara said was correct and later on made a different version and therefore, he is guilty of his conduct under para 19.5(j) of the Bipartite Settlement. To the charge sheet, the first petitioner gave his explanation (Ex. W-7) dated 25-8-81 denying the charges. The enquiry was conducted in which the Officer-Yashodhara the Branch Manager of the concerned branch and the Area Manager were examined on the side of the respondent. The first petitioner apart from examining himself also examined Thiagarajan who wrote the draft in question. The Enquiry Officer found the first petitioner guilty. (Enquiry Officer's report is Ex. W-11 dated 31-5-82). Ex. W-12 is the second show cause notice dated 5-7-82 for which the first petitioner gave his reply dated 19-8-82 under Ex. W-13. Ultimately the first petitioner was dismissed from service by the order dated 23-9-82 (Ex. W-14).

14. While this reference has been pending, the first petitioner died and his legal representatives have been impleaded as petitioners 2 to 4. Although, the first petitioner questioned the justness and fairness of the enquiry, after the death of the first petitioner, and during the course of the arguments, the petitioners did not question the fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry. Therefore, we are now concerned with the questions whether the charges have been proved against the 1st petitioner and if so, whether the punishment meted out to him not proper ?

15. The first charge is that by omitting to give the draft application the scroll number and entering it in the Cashier's scroll, the first petitioner acted in a grossly negligent manner which is likely to involve the bank in serious loss, and therefore it is a misconduct under para 19.5(j). The second charge is that by not reporting surplus cash in his hand before closing the account books and retaining the same with him, the first petitioner had acted dishonestly and in a manner prejudicial to the interest of the bank, and it is also a misconduct on the Clause 19.5(j) of the Bipartite Settlement. I will deal with both these charges together. The fact that the first petitioner while working as a cashier in the respondent-bank on 4-3-80 received an application for the issue of demand draft for Rs. 721.40 alongwith a commission of Rs. 1 and in total Rs. 722.40 that he affixed the cash received seal on the application, had omitted to give a scroll number to the application, and also to enter the receipt of the cash in the cashier's scroll maintained by him, are not denied by the first petitioner. But he claim that it is only an omission. This is a clear case of negligence, though the first petitioner wants to call it as mere omission. But, the question is whether the negligence is so gross as likely to involve the bank in serious loss. A mere omission by the 1st petitioner to enter the receipt of the cash would not, under normal circumstances, cause any loss because before the demand draft is issued, it comes to the notice of the officer who also gives a scroll number and enters the cash in the scroll book maintained by the Officer. That is done atleast before the

Officer signs the demand draft. So, if there is no entry in the cashier's register the Officer's register will show the receipt of the cash towards draft. When the amounts for the day are compared by the Cashier and Officer their account books will not tally, and it could have been found out early that the first petitioner had omitted to mention in his cash register the receipt of the cash towards this draft. But, what happened in this case was when the application for draft had passed through the first petitioner, it is alleged to have gone directly to the demand draft writing section without going through the Officer-Yasodhara, but had come to her for signing the demand draft after the preparation of the draft. But even at that time, the Officer Yasodhara omitted to give the scroll number, and also to register the cash in the scroll book of the Officer. That was why and how, even when they compared their accounts after lunch, there was no difference and it could not be found that there was any omission in the registers maintained by both of them. We must examine how this omission came to light. The Officer-Yasodhara (MW1 before the Enquiry Officer) admitted in her evidence that it was about 2.00 p.m. when they were about to get up for lunch, this application for the demand draft came, and the party was in a hurry to get the draft signed by her and Branch Manager, and therefore by oversight this mistake had occurred on her part. If it is so, it will equally apply to the case of the first petitioner. So, it is evident that there is negligence on the part of the first petitioner and also the Officer Yasodhara (MW1 before the Enquiry Officer) in omitting to give the scroll number, and to enter the cash receipt in their respective registers. But, the respondent contends that the negligence is a gross one likely to cause serious loss to the bank. We have to find out whether such a contention can be accepted. After lunch, the accounts were orally tallied between the Cashier (1st petitioner) and the Officer Yasodhara and the accounts were closed. But, the respondent contends that before closing the accounts the first petitioner should have found the excess cash and he ought to have reported about the same immediately. The respondent also contends that taking advantage of the fact that accounts of himself and the Officer-Yasodhara tallied, the first petitioner developed the desire to misappropriate the amount and therefore, kept it separately. So, we find that even according to the respondent, the first petitioner developed the intention to misappropriate money only after finding that the accounts of himself and the Officer Yasodhara tallied. So, actually when he omitted to make the entry in the register to give scroll number to this draft, he could not have had the intention to misappropriate the money. He could not have at that time known that the Officer-Yasodhara will also omit to enter the receipt of the cash in her register, and that he can misappropriate money. Therefore, at the time when he omitted to give the scroll number and to register the receipt of the cash in his register, he can be stated to have only acted without any mala fide intention. But, the respondent contends that on closing the accounts the first petitioner kept the excess cash separately, but did not report it to the Officer, and his intention was dishonest i.e. to misappropriate the amount. The first petitioner on the other hand had claimed that he had reported about this surplus cash to the Officer-Yasodhara and that she asked him to keep the surplus cash separately. But, Yasodhara stated in her evidence before the Enquiry Officer that in the evening after closing the accounts she remembered about the draft having been issued, and then asked the first petitioner about it, and that it was at that time the first petitioner readily accepted the surplus, and the accounts were rectified. The respondent contends that the action of the first petitioner in not reporting to the Officer immediately about the surplus cash goes to show that he had the dishonest intention to misappropriate the same. Therefore, we will have to find out whether the first petitioner who had acted in a negligent manner had developed the dishonest intention. From the mere fact that he failed to report the surplus cash it cannot be stated that he had developed the dishonest intention. There is no evidence as such to show that he intended to misappropriate money. Even disregarding his case that he reported the matter to the Officer-Yasodhara immediately about the surplus cash, and that she asked him to keep it separately, it is evident that he had kept the surplus cash separately. He did not suppress it. Even according to the respondent, he readily accepted when the Officer-Yasodhara questioned him that he had surplus cash with him. He might have failed in his duty to report, but that cannot be evidence of dishonest intention. The Enquiry Officer has observed to the effect that the first peti-

tioner could have retained the surplus cash, removed the application for the issue of the draft, and then there would be no evidence for the receipt of the cash, and that this would have resulted in serious loss to the bank. There is no evidence to show that the first petitioner even attempted to suppress the cash or remove the application for the draft or even attempted to misappropriate the money. These observations of the Enquiry Officer are only in the realm of conjectures and nothing more. What the first petitioner did or did not do can be a pointer to the alleged dishonest intention on his part. It is not even stated that the application for issue of draft was in his possession, when at least it can be stated that there was a chance for him to remove this application and misappropriate the money. Therefore, it is only a surmise that he could have removed the application for issue of a draft and taken the surplus cash. But mere surmise cannot take the place of proof of the serious charge. It is evident that the first petitioner has not been shown to have acted in a similar negligent manner on any previous occasion. Even the evidence on the side of the respondent is that (MW1 and MW2) this is the first time. The Officer-Yasodhara did not at that time feel that there was a dishonest intention on the part of the first petitioner. After finding out that there was a surplus cash, they merely rectified the accounts by altering the entries. If there had been a dishonest intention, the Officer-Yasodhara would not have allowed him to do so, but would have reported immediately to the Branch Manager. Admittedly, she had reported about this to the Branch Manager only on the next day. It is not as if the manager was not available on the day of this incident. This conduct on her part clearly shows that the first petitioner would not have acted with a dishonest intention to misappropriate the money. Even the Branch Manager has not viewed it as a dishonest intention to misappropriate the money since he had not taken such a view and he had not reported the matters to the Superiors immediately. Therefore, taking into consideration all these facts, I find that though the first petitioner had failed to report about the surplus in his hand after closing the accounts, there is no acceptable evidence to show that he had done so with the dishonest intention to misappropriate the money or causing loss to the bank.

16. Of course, the third charge is that when the Area Manager on a report about this incident came to enquire about this matter, inquired the first petitioner, Officer-Yasodhara and the Branch Manager, and that Officer-Yasodhara informed him in the presence of the first petitioner that after they orally tallied the accounts, the accounts were closed by the first petitioner, and in the evening while closing the accounts, she remembered about this draft, and that when she asked the first petitioner about this draft, he admitted about the surplus cash, that the first petitioner who was also present confirmed it, but, later on changed and stated that it was he who reported about the surplus cash to the Officer, and she asked him to keep it separately. This act is also treated as a misconduct. The evidence of MW1 is that on the first occasion when the Area Manager came to the branch and questioned her, the first petitioner confirmed what all she stated. But on a subsequent occasion, he stated that it was he who found out the surplus cash. But the Area Manager stated that he (Area Manager) had come there only once. Therefore, there could not have been a subsequent occasion when the first petitioner could have given a different story to the Area Manager than what he stated on the first occasion. Therefore, this contradiction in the evidence of the Officer-Yasodhara and the evidence of the Area Manager goes against the case of the respondent. Therefore, it cannot be stated that this charge has been proved.

17. Therefore, taking into consideration all these aspects, I find that the first petitioner had acted negligently and failed to give a scroll number registering the cash received towards the draft in his register and in not reporting to the Officer-Yasodhara, about the surplus cash immediately after orally tallying the accounts. Therefore, the next question is whether the punishment imposed upon the first petitioner is disproportionate to the charge proved against him? It is clear that the first petitioner had acted negligently and failed in his duty. But, it cannot be stated to be a gross negligence or a serious failure in his duty which had caused or is likely to cause serious loss or prejudice to the bank, in the circumstances pointed out above and when the cash was available with him, and he had admitted that

there was surplus cash. Therefore, it cannot be stated that he acted in a manner which is likely to cause serious loss or great prejudice to the respondent-bank. In such circumstances, the punishment of dismissal from service will be disproportionate to the charges proved against him. Of course, the respondent here is a banking institution. But, merely because the first petitioner had acted negligently and had failed in his duty in the manner stated above, it cannot be stated that his continuance in the bank would seriously prejudice or affect the affairs of the respondent-bank adversely. In this connection we have also to take into account that even the Officer-Yasodhara had acted negligently in not registering the cash in her scroll book, and in failing to give a scroll number, and in signing the demand draft, without checking whether the cash has been registered in her account book. But she has not been dismissed from service. Therefore, when both the Officer and the first petitioner had acted negligently, different types of punishments cannot be imposed on them, grave punishment cannot be imposed upon the first petitioner only. So, I find that the punishment of dismissal from service imposed on the 1st petitioner Boomibalagan has to be set aside. But, since the first petitioner is no more, the relief of reinstatement cannot be given to him, but his legal representatives will be entitled to whatever benefits that are subsequently available.

18. So far as the punishment that could have been imposed upon the first petitioner Boomibalagan is concerned, I am of view that his increment for one year without cumulative effect could be cut. In fact it will mean that this punishment of increment cut with be deemed to have been imposed on him instead of the punishment of dismissal from service, and the said amount be deducted from whatever amounts that are payable to the legal heirs of deceased first petitioner Boomibalagan.

19. In the result an award is passed holding that the dismissal of the first petitioner Boomibalagan (since deceased) from service is not justified. While setting aside the order of dismissal, his increment is ordered to be cut for one year without cumulative effect. Since, the first petitioner Boomibalagan has died and the relief of re-instatement is not granted, his legal representatives will be entitled to the backwages and other attendant benefits less the amount to be deducted by way of increment-cut as ordered herein. No costs.

Dated, this the 5th day of April, 1994

THIRU K. SAMPATH KUMARAN, Industrial Tribunal

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For both sides and None.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Workmen :

- Ex. W-1/15-5-80.—Confidential letter from the Bank of Madura Ltd., Madurai to the Management-Bank (copy).
- Ex. W-2/12-3-81.—Letter from Management Bank to Tmt. S. Yasodhara, Officer, Bank of Madurai, Madurai (copy).
- Ex. W-3/12-3-81.—Letter from Management Bank to the 1st Petitioner-workman (copy).
- Ex. W-4/16-4-81.—Explanation by Smt. S. Yasodhara to the Management-Bank (copy).
- Ex. W-5/16-4-81.—Explanation by the Petitioner-workman to the Management Bank (copy).
- Ex. W-6/23-7-81.—Charge sheet issued to the petitioner-workmen (copy).
- Ex. W-7/25-8-81.—Explanation by the Petitioner-workmen to Ex. W-6 (copy).
- Ex. W-8/29-8-81.—Confidential report from the Bank of Madura Ltd. Madurai to the Management Bank (copy).
- Ex. W-9/9-9-81.—Notice about enquiry.
- Ex. W-10/9-1-82.—Written arguments on behalf of the petitioner-workman (copy).

- Ex. W-11/31-5-82.—Report of the Enquiry Officer (copy).
- Ex. W-12/5-7-82.—Show cause Notice issued to the petitioner-workman (copy).
- Ex. W-13/19-8-82.—Reply by the defence representative of the petitioner-workman to Ex. W-12 (copy).
- Ex. W-14/23-9-82.—Order of the Management Bank issued to the Petitioner-workman (copy).
- Ex. W-15/3-11-82.—Appeal by the Petitioner-workman (copy).
- Ex. W-16/3-11-82.—Proceedings of the Enquiry Officer (copy).
- Ex. W-17/31-3-83.—Letter from the petitioner-workman to the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras for conciliation (copy).
- Ex. W-18/27-5-83.—Reply by the Management-Bank to Ex. W-17 filed before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) I, Madras (copy).
- Ex. W-19/7-6-84.—Letter from the Petitioner-workman's Union to the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras submitting list of authorities (copy).
- Ex. W-20/4-12-84.—Conciliation failure report alongwith minutes of conciliation proceedings held on 20-6-83 (copy).

For Management :

- Ex. M.1/4-3-80.—Statement showing total receipts (copy).
- Ex. M.2/4-3-80.—Copy of draft application for Rs. 312 in favour of Hindustan Lever Ltd.,
- Ex. M.3/4-3-80.—Copy of draft application for Rs. 487.50 in favour of Hindustan Lever Ltd.,
- Ex. M.4/4-3-80.—Copy of draft for Rs. 721.40 in favour of JKR Auto Distributors, Delhi.
- Ex. M.6/4-3-90.—Extract of folio of Cash Balance Coin war Register for Rs. 38,007.96 (copy).
- Ex. M.7/4-3-90.—Cash received statement for Rs. 40,527.96 (copy).
- Ex. M.8/4-3-90.—Note to Board (copy).

THIRU K. SAMPATH KUMARAN, Industrial Tribunal

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1994

कां०सा० 1964.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद से औद्योगिक अधिकरण वांगंगल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-17011/52/89-आई०आर/बी-2]

बी०के० शर्मा, ई०ए० अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1994

S.O. 1964.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Warangal as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-7-1994.

[No. L-17011/52/89-1R (B-II)]

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT AT WARANGAL (A.P.)

PRESENT :

Sri L. Appa Rao, B.S., B.Ed., B.L., Judge.

Dated this the 25th day of January, 1994

Industrial Dispute (Central) 1 of 1991

BETWEEN

G. Pratap S/o Peeraiah,
H. No. 20-4-103,
Fort Warangal (West),
Warangal Dist. (A.P.) ... Petitioner

AND

The Senior Divisional Manager,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
Post Box No. 17,
Podduturi Complex, Hanamkonda,
Dist. Warangal (A.P.) ... Respondent

This dispute coming on before me for final hearing on 27-8-1993 and upon perusing the reference, claim statement, counter and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Sri P. M. Vijay, representative of the petitioner and of Sri Dussa Janardhan, advocate for the respondent, the matter having stood over for consideration till this date the court passed the following :—

AWARD

This is a reference made under Section 10 (2-A) (1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) by the Central Government to decide :—

"Whether the action of the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Warangal in terminating the services of Shri G. Pratap, Sub-staff w.e.f. 12-9-1987 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. The claimant filed claim statement contending that he was appointed as a temporary Sub-Staff on 24-11-1986. The respondent made an advertisement in the news paper dated 17-11-1986 and the petitioner applied for the same and he was selected for the post of Sub-Staff. Thereafter the petitioner's services were confirmed and he became a permanent sub-staff at the branch of respondent at Warangal on the pay scale of Rs. 430-10-450-20-790 with the salary Roll No. 558125. At the time of the interview the petitioner submitted his transfer Certificate regarding his qualification etc., and the same was verified by the respondent. The respondent has obtained all the necessary certificates from the petitioner. While the petitioner was discharging his duties as sub-staff at the Branch Office, Warangal the respondent issued termination letter dated 7-9-1987 by registered post and the same was received by the petitioner on 11-9-1987. In the said letter the respondent stated that the petitioner has submitted false information and obtained job as Sub-staff and also threatened the petitioner stating that he will be handed over to police and also liable for action under criminal procedure code. On 12-9-1987 the petitioner attended the office and submitted a reply stating that he has not submitted any false information and he has not given any forged certificate and that he has not cheated the respondent. But the respondent refused to consider the request of the petitioner and forced the petitioner to sign on a blank paper. On 14-9-1987 the petitioner attended the respondent's office and he has given the detailed clarification regarding his innocence and requested to verify the certificates which have been submitted by him at the time of the interview. But the respondent refused to verify any record and informed the petitioner that his services were terminated from 12-9-1987. The petitioner was forced to sign on the resignation letter which was typed by the officials of the respondent and he was threatened that if he does not sign on the resignation letter he will be handed over to police. As such the petitioner signed on the resignation letter dated

14-9-1987 and so this resignation is not wilful. Without any enquiry as per law and as per the rules of the respondent the order of termination letter dated 12-9-1987 was issued to the petitioner and so it is illegal and arbitrary and against the principles of the natural justice. Hence the said order dated 12-9-1987 is to be set aside and the respondent is to be directed to reinstated the petitioner into service with continuity of service with back wages and attendant benefits.

3. Counter is filed by the respondent contending that it is the petitioner had applied for the post of sub-staff to the LIC of India Divisional Office, Warangal in the month of November, 1986 in response to the notification made by the corporation on 17-11-1986 and general notice made on 24-11-1986. Subsequently the petitioner was appointed for the post of sub-staff on the basis of qualification certificates submitted by him. After recruitment on verification it was revealed that the applicant submitted false and forged certificates of qualification for the recruitment of sub-staff. Before appointment of the petitioner as a sub-staff, the corporation has served a letter offering him for the post of sub-staff on 10-3-1987 stating that the appointment of the petitioner as a sub-staff shall be governed by Staff Regulations of the corporation and there will be probation period of six months. As per the para No. 11 of offer letter the said appointment was on the basis of the information given by the applicant and if it is transpired that any information has been suppressed or wrong information had been given in the application, besides other remedies available to the corporation under law his services with corporation shall be terminated and terminal benefits if any accrued to the applicant will be forfeited. The corporation issued a letter dated 7-9-1987 to the petitioner informing that the qualification particulars furnished by him are not genuine and the petitioner was asked to give reply. It is false to say that the petitioner was threatened by the corporation and the petitioner was forced to sign on blank papers. The petitioner was terminated by the corporation on 12-9-1987, but not on 7-9-1987. The corporation never threatened the petitioner at any moment and the corporation had not taken the signatures of the petitioner on blank papers as alleged. It is not correct to say that the petitioner has given detailed clarification with regard to his innocence and submitted his reply. It is not correct to say that the corporation has not verified the records and forced the petitioner to sign on the resignation letter which was typed by the corporation by threatening him. In fact all the certificates submitted by the petitioner were verified and confirmed that the memorandum of the marks submitted by the petitioner is false and forged one. Hence the corporation issued show cause notice and terminated the services of the petitioner on 12-9-1987 and the corporation has not forced the petitioner submitting his resignation. The termination orders are not arbitrary and not illegal.

4. The corporation made notification on 17-11-1986 calling for the applications for the post of sub-staff in Warangal Division. Later the corporation made a notification on 24-11-86 stating that the applicant should pass 9th class by securing a minimum marks of 35% in all subjects. On the basis of the notification the petitioner applied for the post of sub-staff and submitted transfer certificate and 9th class marks sheet issued by the Head Master Government School, Fort, Warangal. On the basis of the certificates the petitioner has appointed as Sub-staff in the month of March, 1987. Subsequently there were some anonymous complaints alleging that 9th class certificates submitted by some candidates are wrote genuine. In order to find out the truth the corporation wrote letters to the concerned schools, and authorities requesting them to verify the records and marks obtained by the candidates. The Head Master, Government School, Fort Warangal issued extract of memorandum of marks obtained by the petitioner by him letter dated 25-8-1987. The memorandum of marks submitted by the petitioner was different with the memorandum of marks issued by the Head Master of Fort Warangal. As per the certificate produced by the petitioner he secured 38 marks in English, 40 Marks in Telugu, 37 marks in Hindi, 43 marks in Social studies, 36 marks in General Science and 52 marks in Maths per 100. Whereas as per certificate given by the Head Master, Fort Warangal he secured 28 marks in English, 40 marks in Telugu, 37 marks in Hindi, 22 marks in Social Studies, 26 marks in General Science and 52 marks in Maths, per hundred. As such the applicant has not secured minimum of 35% of marks in English, Social Studies, and General Science but even then he submitted a false memorandum of certificate for recruitment. To make sure, the corporation has deputed Sri R. Radha Krishna Murthy, Administrative Officer of the corporation to verify

the school records personally and submit the report. Accordingly the said Administrative Officer verified the school records of the Warangal and reported that the marks given by the Head Master are tallying with the record in the school register. The Head Master also confirms that the marks last submitted by the applicant is not genuine and was not issued by him. On the basis of the information and available records the corporation has decided to terminate the services of the petitioner since he has produced false and forged certificate to secure the employment. Accordingly, the corporation issued show cause notice on 7-9-1987 calling for explanation of the petitioner since he produced false certificate and cheated the corporation to get the employment. But the applicant has not submitted his explanation within the stipulated period and subsequently also. Hence the corporation decided to terminate the services and accordingly sent the termination letter dated 12-9-1987. Later on 14-9-1987 the applicant himself submitted his resignation letter for the post of sub-staff and requested the corporation to accept it. The corporation accepted his resignation. The corporation paid his salary to the petitioner upto 12-9-1987 i.e. till the date of termination. Since then the petitioner is not an employee of the corporation. After lapse of 7 years the petitioner raised this dispute with false allegations. Hence this dispute is barred by limitation and the applicant has no locus standi to raise such dispute at this stage. The continuation of services of the petitioner as a sub staff does not arise at any moment as the petitioner himself submitted his resignation letter and moreover he was terminated by the corporation. Hence the petition is to be dismissed with costs.

5. The points for consideration are :—

(1) Whether the action of the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Warangal in terminating the services of Sri G. Pratap, Sub staff w.e.f. 12-9-1987 is justified ?

(2) If not to what relief the workman concerned is entitled

6. Points No. 1 and 2—The petitioner is examined as WW-1. In chief examination he stated that he worked as sub-staff in the respondent corporation from November, 1986 for a period of 2 months temporarily. On seeing advertisement in the news paper for appointment of sub-staff he applied for it. On 1-1-87 he wrote written test and he was selected for the post. At the time of the selection the respondent verified all his original certificates and then only they gave him orders of appointment. While working he received Ex. M-9 letter dated 11-9-1987. He sent reply Ex. W-1 dated 11-9-87 and submitted it on 12-9-1987. The respondent gave him termination letter Ex. M-10. On 14-9-87 he went to the office and they obtained his signature on a paper Ex. M-11. They promised to appoint him again. Ex. W-2 is his Xth class transfer Certificate. Ex. W-3 is the marksheet of S.S.C. issued by the Board of Secondary School. Ex. W-4 is the marksheet issued by the School for his 9th class. No enquiry was conducted prior to issue of termination order. He filed this petition to direct the respondent to reinstate him into service with continuity of service and back wages. His request in this matter was referred by the Central Government to this court. In cross examination he admitted that he did not mention in his application for the appointment of Sub staff, that he appeared for SSC. Ex. M-3 is the application and Ex. M-4 is the xerox copy of marksheet submitted by him along with Ex. M-3. Ex. M-4 marksheet was signed by Asst. Head Master, Dasharatharamiah. The Head Master was Nageshwar Rao at that time. Ex. M-7 was signed by the Asst. Head Master Dasharatharamiah, along with the Head Master Nageshwar Rao. Ex. W-3 is signed by the Head Master Nageshwar Rao and this marks relates to S.S.C. examination. Ex. W-4 is signed by the present Head Master and this relates to 9th class examination. He does not have any acknowledgement in token of receiving his reply to the show cause notice by the respondent. He handed over the reply in Personnel Department of Divisional Office, but he cannot give the name of the person to whom he handed over. Ex. M-5 is his appointment letter. It is true that the probation period is fixed for six months from the date of appointment. It is mentioned in Ex. M-4 in para 11 that in case of any wrong information the services will be terminated. He denied the suggestion that since he furnished wrong marksheet at the time of appointment, after

verification, since the marks furnished by him are found to be incorrect, the respondent terminated his services. He also denied the suggestion that he did not give any reply to the show cause notice. Ex. M-11 contains his signatures. He denied the suggestion that he voluntarily submitted his resignation letter to the respondent, on 14-9-87 and that he was removed from service legally.

7. On behalf of the respondent/management MW-1 Asst. Administrative Officer is examined. He deposed that on 1-11-1986 they gave notification Ex. M-1 for appointment of Sub-staff in Warangal Division and it was published in Telugu daily paper Eenadu on 24th and 25th November, 1986. They gave the qualification as pass in 9th or 10th class, who did not get more than 50% of marks in 10th class. The 9th class, passed candidates have to secure more than 35% marks. They gave notification on 29-12-86 as per Ex. M-2 to the effect that the 9th class passed candidates must secure not less than 35% of marks. The petitioner applied as a candidate for appointment along with his bio-data dated 28-11-86 alongwith covering letter Ex. M-3. He submitted his marksheet of 9th class (Ex. M-4) in January.

8. After interview they gave appointment order to the petitioner as per Ex. M-5 on 10-3-1987. They have got their own rules and Regulations with regard to the appointment and they are mentioned in the appointment letter. The candidates appointed are to be abided by the conditions laid down in the appointment letter and also Staff Regulations. One of the conditions is that he has to undergo probation for a period of 6 months. The petitioner joined duty on 13-3-87 in Warangal Branch. After appointment of sub-staff they have called their marks from their respective Head Master for verification. The petitioner studied in Government High School at Fort Warangal. They sent letter dated 27-7-87 Ex. M-6 to the Head Master of Fort Warangal High School to send the marksheet of the petitioner and accordingly Ex. M-7 was sent. According to their notification the candidate has to obtain more than 35% of marks in each subject of 9th class. As per the certificate of marks submitted by the petitioner alongwith application he secured more than 35% of marks in each subject and out of 600 marks he got total marks of 245. As per the marksheet sent by the Head Master, Fort Warangal dated 25-8-87, the petitioner obtained total marks of 205 out of 600 marks and he has not secured more than 35% in English, Social Studies and General Science. Afterwards they have deputed their Administrative Officer, R. Radhakrishnamurthy to Government High School, Fort Warangal for personal verification of the marks of the petitioner. He has personally verified and obtained one more marksheet Ex. M-8 from the Head Master on 7-9-87. Then they gave show cause notice dated 7-9-87 as per Ex. M-9 to the petitioner calling for explanation within 3 days. But the petitioner did not give any explanation. Hence they gave termination order Ex. M-10 to the petitioner on 12-9-87. On 14-9-87 the petitioner submitted his resignation letter Ex. M-11 which has accepted by the respondent. The petitioner approached the Labour Commissioner at Hyderabad as per Ex. M-12 and the respondent received notice Ex. M-13 in that matter. They sent reply Ex. M-14 to that notice. According to their Standing Orders and also their rules and regulations the petitioner is not entitled for any relief in this petition. In cross-examination he admits that in Ex. M-1 they have not mentioned that the candidates should obtain not less than 35% of marks in each subject in 9th class. They have never given any paper publication to the above effect. But they sent this clarification to all the candidates who have applied. In Ex. M-4 the Administrative Office made an endorsement to the effect that he verified and that Administrative Officer Radhakrishnamurthy initialled. The contents of Ex. M-14 are correct. There are no reasons mentioned for resignation in Ex. M-11. There is no enquiry conducted prior to removal of the petitioner from service. He does not know personally as to what happened on 12-9-87. He does not know whether there are two other candidates who studied 9th class in the same High School with the same name and father's name. The signatures of Incharge Head Master in Ex. M-4 and Ex. M-7 appear to be one and the same.

8. MW-2 is the then Administrative Officer. He deposed that he has called for applications in 1986 for appointment of Sub-staff in Warangal Division. In the 1st advertisement they have stated the qualification should be pass in 9th class or 10th class. On the instructions received from their higher officer, they asked all the candidates who have applied for post with 9th class pass to verify whether they have secured

35% of marks in each subject in 9th class, and the communication is sent as per Ex. M-2. The petitioner sent his marksheet on their communication with a covering letter Ex. M-3 and Ex. M-4 is the marksheet. On the basis of the Ex. M-4 they called the petitioner to appear for the written test. The petitioner is also qualified in written test along with some others and so they called all of them for oral interview. Including this petitioner the others who are also qualified in the interview are given orders of appointment. Thereafter they received some unanimous letters stating that some of the candidates who appeared for selection with 9th class qualification produced false marks sheets. As such they addressed letters to the concerned Head Masters to certify the genuineness or otherwise of the marks sheets Ex. M-6 is the letter sent to the Head Master Government High School, Fort Warangal, in which the petitioner studied. Ex. M-7 is the marks sheet sent by the Head Master relating to the petitioner after verification of school records. The admission number and serial number given in Ex. M-4 and Ex. M-7 tallied to each other, but they find difference in the marks obtained by the candidate. The petitioner has not obtained 35% of marks in English, Social Studies and General Science as per Ex. M-7. He personally went to the above said school for verification of marks of the petitioner on the direction of the then Senior Divisional Manager, Warangal. He has personally verified the school register and noted the marks as per Ex. M-8 which is signed by him and also by the Head Master. Exs. M-8 and M-7 tallied to each other in all respects. As per Ex. M-9 they gave show cause notice to the petitioner calling for his explanation for securing job by submitting false certificate. But the petitioner did not give any explanation. Hence they have terminated the services of the petitioner as per Ex. M-10 on 12-9-1987. Ex. M-11 is the letter submitted by the petitioner on 14-9-1987 to the Senior Divisional Manager, Warangal and the same was accepted on the same day. He has represented this case on behalf of the respondent before the A.C.L. (Central). They gave reply Ex. M-14 before the A.C.L. Central. There are certain conditions imposed in the appointment letter given to the petitioner as per Ex. M-5. As per para 11 of Ex. M-5 the services of the petitioner are liable to be terminated in case of his giving false information while securing job in the corporation. In Cross-examination he admits that in Ex. M-9 they mentioned that the petitioner submitted a false certificate but they have not mentioned the fact that the petitioner got the job by showing false marks in his 9th class marksheet. The proforma of Ex. M-7 was typed in their office upto column 6, cols. 7 to 9 are left blank to be filled up by the school authorities. There is no reply given for col. 8 by the Head Master. He does not remember whether they questioned the Head Master about non-filling up of col. 8 in Ex. M-7. In Ex. M-14 they mentioned that the salary of the petitioner was paid upto 12-9-87. On 12-9-87 the petitioner was on C.L. He cannot say whether he attended office upto 11-9-87. He is not aware whether the petitioner was present on 11th and 12th of September, 1987 in the office in which he was working. He denied the suggestion that the petitioner gave his explanation for the show cause notice. They have not conducted any enquiry prior to the termination of the services of the petitioner.

9. The admitted facts are that the respondent gave notification on 17-11-1986 as per Ex. M-1 in the news paper 'Eenadu' calling for applications for appointment of sub-staff in Warangal Division. In the said notification the qualification is mentioned as pass in 9th or 10th class who did not get more than 50% marks in 10th class. Subsequently they sent communication as per Ex. M-2 to all the candidates who have applied for the post with 9th class pass to verify whether they have secured 35% of marks in each subject in 9th class. Thereafter the petitioner sent his marks sheet Ex. M-4 along with covering letter Ex. M-3. Subsequently written test was conducted and oral test was also conducted in which the petitioner was selected. As such the petitioner was given orders of appointment on 10-3-1987 as per Ex. M-5. Subsequently the respondent addressed Ex. M-6 letter to the Head Master, High School, Fort Warangal in which the petitioner studies to certify the genuineness or otherwise of the marks sheet Ex. M-4 submitted by the petitioner for appointment. Then the Head Master sent Ex. M-7 mark sheet giving the marks obtained by the petitioner in 9th class. The admission number and serial number given in the marks certificate Ex. M-4 given

by the petitioner at the time of appointment and Ex. M-7 marks certificate given by the Head Master tallied to each other, but apparently the marks are different in certain subjects in both the certificates. According to Ex. M-7 the petitioner has obtained less than 35 marks in English, Social Studies and General Science. Hence MW-2 was deputed by the Senior Divisional Manager, Warangal to personally verify the school registers of Government High School, Fort Warangal in respect of the marks obtained by the petitioner in 9th class. As such MW-2 went and met the Head Master concerned and he verified the school register in the presence of the Head Master and noted the marks obtained by the petitioner in 9th class as per Ex. M-8 which is signed by him and also the Head Master. Ex. M-7 and Ex. M-8 tallied to each other in all respects. Thereafter the respondent gave show cause notice Ex. M-9 calling for the explanation of the petitioner for securing job by submitting false certificate. Afterwards the respondent sent orders of termination as per Ex. M-10 on 12-9-1987.

10. According to the petitioner herein that the submitted Ex. W-1 reply dated 11-9-87 for the show cause notice received by him as per Ex. M-9. But according to the respondent the petitioner never submitted any explanation or reply muchless the original of Ex. W-1 as contended by the petitioner. In this connection we have to go through the cross-examination of WW-1. He clearly admits that he does not have any acknowledgement in token of receiving his reply to the notice. He handed over the reply in Personnel Department of Divisional Office, but he cannot give the name of the person to whom he handed over. As can be seen from Ex. W-1 there is no endorsement or acknowledgement in token of it's being given in the office of the respondent at any time. It does not also contain any stamp or seal of the respondent office. So there is absolutely no convincing evidence placed by the petitioner to prove that he has given the original of Ex. W-1 to the respondent at any time. Admittedly the petitioner herein submitted Ex. M-4 marks sheet along with his covering letter Ex. M-3 after receiving Ex. M-2 communication from the respondent. According to this communication Ex. M-2, the petitioner was informed that unless one secures not less than 35% of marks in each subject in 9th class, he is not at all eligible for appointment of sub-staff. At the time of the interview the respondent verified the certificate Ex. M-4 and since the petitioner secured more than 35% of marks in each subject in 9th class, the petitioner was appointed as sub-staff. The petitioner was issued Ex. M-5 letter of appointment. In this Ex. M-5, as per condition No. 11, "the appointment is offered to you on the basis of the information given by you in your application. If it transpires that any information had been suppressed or wrong information had been given in your said application, besides other remedies available to us under law, your services with the Corporation will be terminated and terminal benefits, if any, accrued to you will be forfeited". Since the respondent received some anonymous letters with regard to the marks sheets submitted by the candidates for appointment of sub-staff, the respondent wanted to verify the marks sheets of all the candidates appointed as sub-staff including the petitioner herein. In that connection the respondent addressed letter Ex. M-6, in response to which the Head Master Government High School Fort Warangal, where the petitioner studied sent the marks sheet of the petitioner for 9th class as per Ex. M-7. On comparison of Ex. M-4 and M-7 which contained the same admission number of serial number, they found the petitioner secured more than 35% of marks in all subject i.e. total of 245 in Ex. M-4, whereas as per Ex. M-7 the petitioner obtained less than 35% of marks in three subjects i.e. English, Social Studies, and General Science and that he obtained total marks of 203 out of 600 marks. So to confirm the certificate sent by the Head Master as per Ex. M-7, MW-2 personally went to the School and verified the records in the presence of the Head Master, Fort Warangal High School and found the marks as given by the Head Master in Ex. M-7 are correct and he noted the same in Ex. M-8, which is signed by the MW-2 and the Head Master. That means Exs. M-7 and M-8 tallied to each other in all respect. So under such circumstances the respondent was forced to come to the conclusion that the respondent submitted Ex. M-6 marks sheet of 9th class with wrong marks in English, Social Studies and General Science. That is the reason why the respondent issued Ex. M-9 show cause notice calling for explanation of the petitioner and the petitioner did not submit any explanation, so under such circumstances invoking condition No. 11 of the appointment order Ex. M-5, the

respondent passed orders of termination as per Ex. M-10 dated 12-9-87 and it was sent to the petitioner. Here the contention of the petitioner is that the marks sheets Ex. M-7 and M-8 relate to some other students with same name and they do not relate to the petitioner herein. This contention cannot be accepted for the simple reason that as can be seen from Exs. M-4 and M-7 the admission number and serial number are one and the same. As such it must be held that Ex. M-7 marks sheet given by the Head Master relates to the petitioner herein only and it does not relate to any other candidate. The petitioner relies on Ex. W-4 marks sheet of 9th class. He admits in cross that it is signed by the present Head Master and it was obtained recently. The original marks sheet Ex. M-7 was signed by the Asst. Head Master Dasharatharamaiah along with the Head Master Nageshwar Rao, but Ex. M-4 marks sheet submitted by the petitioner at the time of the appointment was signed only by Asst. Head Master Dasharatharamaiah. Ex. W-3 which is the marks sheet of S.S.C., examination has no relevancy in this case. The petitioner himself admits that he did not mention in his application of sub-staff that he appeared for S.S.C. The other contention raised by the petitioner is that neither the Head Master nor the Asst. Head Master are examined to prove Ex. M-7. It is in evidence that after receipt of Ex. M-7 marks sheet signed by both the Head Master and the Asst. Head Master on the letter Ex. M-6 addressed to the High School, MW-2 personally went to the school concerned and verified the records of 9th class in the presence of the Head Master and noted the marks as per Ex. M-8, which is also signed by the Head Master Nageshwar Rao, besides MW-2. There is no reason for the Officer of the status of an administrative officer like MW-2 to give false evidence against the petitioner. There is no enmity or grudge between the petitioner and the MW-2 to speak any falsehood against the petitioner. Further the silence on the part of the petitioner for not giving reply of Ex. M-9 show cause notice also proves that he has submitted Ex. M-4 marks sheet with false marks and secured appointment as sub-staff. It is in evidence of MWs-1 and 2 that on 14-9-1987 the petitioner submitted his resignation letter Ex. M-11 which was accepted by the respondent. The petitioner admits his signature in this letter Ex. M-11, but his contention is that he was threatened and forced to sign in Ex. M-11. But to establish this fact there is absolutely no evidence placed by the petitioner. Further the petitioner did not move his lips about the respondent obtaining forcible resignation letter from him till he submitted petition before the Asst. Commissioner of Labour, Central at Hyderabad on 24-5-1989 as per Ex. M-12. That means the petitioner kept quiet nearly for about two years without complaining to any higher authorities about the respondent obtaining his signature by force on the resignation letter. The long silence on the part of the petitioner proves that he has willingly submitted his resignation letter on 14-9-1985 after receiving orders of termination letter dated 12-9-1987 as per Ex. M-10.

11. As per Staff Regulations of the respondent in Chapter-II, Section 2 deals with Probation. Clause 14(2) reads "persons appointed posts belonging to classes III and IV shall on the first appointment in the Corporation's service, be required to be on probation for 6 months". So it is clear that the services of the petitioner are only under probation by the time of the termination and that his services are not at all confirmed. That is the reason why the respondent issued show cause notice and as the petitioner did not choose to submit any explanation or reply, the respondent issued orders of termination as per Ex. M-10, without taking any enquiry as it is not necessary for employees under probation. Further as per condition No. 11 of the appointment order, it is clearly and categorically mentioned the services of the probationer will be terminated, if information furnished by him for securing job is found to be incorrect or false. In this case on hand the petitioner submitted Ex. M-4 marks sheet with false entries as detected by the respondent subsequently and so invoking condition No. 11 of Ex. M-5 appointment order, the services of the petitioner are terminated after issuing show cause notice. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted a decision reported in 1993 L.L.R. Page 30 (Arvind Kumar Hiralal Mehta Vs. Bank of Baroda and Others). The facts of this decision have absolutely no application to the facts of this case. In the decision cited the chargesheet is vague. Further as per the record the Head Cashier was felt to be quite diligent, with clean record and he has taken all precautions required of him and that the locking system found to be defective. So under such

circumstances, it was held that the findings of the enquiry officer are perverse. But in the case on hand admittedly the petitioner is not a regular employee and that he is only a probationer. The petitioner was removed since he violated condition No. 11 of appointment order while undergoing probation. In fact there is no chargesheet and no enquiry was conducted in the case on hand, since it was not necessary. Nextly he relied on other decision reported in 1993 L.L.R. page (State Bank of India Vs. D. C. Aggarwal and others). In this matter the enquiry officer used some material against the petitioner, which was collected behind the back of delinquent and copy of the same was not supplied to the delinquent. As stated above in the case on hand, there is no Departmental enquiry conducted by any enquiry officer. The petitioner in the case on hand is only a probationer bound by certain conditions of appointment order. The respondent collected sufficient material through the officers concerned and basing on the reliable records it was found that the petitioner submitted false information for securing employment and as such the petitioner was terminated from service after giving notice. Further the petitioner himself voluntarily submitted his resignation letter which was accepted by the respondent. As such the facts of the above decision have no application to the facts of the case on hand. Lastly he cited 1991 L.L.R. page 6 (Desh Raj Gupta Vs. The Industrial Tribunal IV U.P. Lucknow and another). This decision is with regard to the back wages. Only when reinstatement is ordered, we have to consider this decision. But in the case on hand the petitioner is not entitled for any reinstatement. So from the above discussion it is to be held that the Management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Warangal is justified in terminating the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 12-9-1987. As such the petitioner is not entitled for any relief in this matter. These points are answered accordingly against the petitioner.

12. In the result, an award is passed confirming the orders passed by the respondent against the petitioner and holding that the petitioner is not entitled for any relief. This reference is accordingly answered.

Dictated to stenographer and transcribed by him, corrected and given under my hand the seal of this court on this the 25th day of January, 1994.

U. APPA RAO, Industrial Tribunal.

Sd/- Judge

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Petitioner :

WW-1—G. Pratap, dated 3-7-1993.

For Respondent :

1. MW-1—P. Anjaneya Prasad, dated 6-2-1993.

2. MW-2—R. Radhakrishna Murthy, dated 26-6-1993.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Petitioner :

Ex. W-1—Reply dated 11-9-87.

Ex. W-2—Transfer Certificate.

Ex. W-3—Memo of Marks of 10th class.

Ex. W-4—Marks of 9th class.

For Respondent :

Ex. M-1—Notification dated 17-11-1986.

Ex. M-2—Notification dated 29-12-1986.

Ex. M-3—Application.

Ex. M-4—Marks Sheet of 9th class.

Ex. M-5—Appointment letter.

Ex. M-6—Letter addressed to Head Master.

Ex. M-7—Marks sheet dated 25-8-87.

Ex. M-8—Marks Sheet dated 7-9-1987.

Ex. M-9—Show Cause Notice.

Ex. M-10—Termination orders.

Ex. M-11—Resignation Letter.

Ex. M-12—Application before Labour Office.

Ex. M-13—Notice dated 30-5-1989.

Ex. M-14—Reply to Ex. M-13, dated 12-6-1989.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

कांसा 1965.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पश्चिम रेलवे के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सं० 1, बम्बई के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 20-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-41011/37/90-आई आर (डी यू)]
वी.के. शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O 1965.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (11 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1 Bombay as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Western Railway and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-7-94.

[No. I-41011/37/90 JR(DU)]
V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-18 OF 1991

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Western Railway.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCEES :

For the Management.—Shri P. R. Pai, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri M. B. Anchan, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Railways

STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, dated the 4th day of July, 1994

AWARD

The following dispute has been referred to this Tribunal by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, for adjudication under section 10(1)(d), read with section 2A of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.

"Whether the action of the employer of Div. Rly. Manager, Western Railway in terminating the three casual labourers, namely, Shri Pandurang B. Patil, Shri Narhar Shankar and Shri Janardhan R. w.e.f. 21-10-85, 22-10-85 and 9-5-85 respectively is justified? If not, what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to?"

2. The admitted position is that, three persons were engaged as Casual Labourers and their services were terminated on the respective dates mentioned in the schedule above. The contention of the workmen is that the termination of their services is illegal, in as much as, they were retrenched without following the provisions of law. They have given the details of the services rendered by them, in the statement of claim filed.

3. The employees contended that they were entitled to the grant of 'temporary status' since they had completed 120 days of continuous service. The Grant of Temporary Status is an automatic action entitled the employees the benefits applicable to the Temporary Railway Servants. Their services could not have been terminated without following the conditions preceding retrenchment, and/or without following the provisions of Indian Railway Establishment Manual, para 2305, and the notes inserted thereunder. The services came to be terminated because of irregular attendance and in such cases, as per circular dated 31-7-1982, show cause notice was required to be given to them before terminating their services. According to them, attainment of temporary status gave them rights and privileges of Temporary Railway Servants as provided by paras 2511 and 2301 of the Indian Railway Establishment Manual.

4. They further contended that they have completed 240 days continuous service. Since the provisions of section 25F were not followed, their termination is bad in law, unjust and void. So they say and claim the relief of declaration that they continued to be in service and entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and consequential benefits.

5. On behalf of the Railway Management, written statement has been filed. It is stated that the services were terminated, but the correct dates are 28-7-1987, 30-6-1987 and 29-6-1987 in respect of S/Shri. Pandurang B. Patil, Narhar Shankar, and Janardan R. respectively. It is further submitted that they are not retrenched. Their services were terminated in accordance with law. There was a case of habitual irregular attendance. Only Mr. Patil had attained the Temporary Status, as on 7-3-1986. However, the other two had not been granted the temporary status. The dates of their engagement and termination are given in the written statement under para 6. The dates of absence are also mentioned. In short, the contention is that for the absence and their irregular attendance, their services came to be terminated. It was done by notice as laid down in para 2302 of the IREM, read with para 149 of the Railway Establishment Code, Vol. I (R-1), without payment of compensation. Question of contravening the provisions of section 25 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not arise in as much as the principle of last come first to go is observed. It is denied that they had completed 120 days, and/or one year's continuous service.

6. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on either side. Written arguments have been also adduced in support by the parties.

7. The admitted position being that, their services were terminated, it is not necessary to examine the material in that behalf. It is urged that the dates mentioned in the schedule are incorrect. In my opinion, it is not very relevant. However, I may state that the dates mentioned by the management could be taken to be for the purpose of this reference correct. It is seen from the written statement that Mr. Pandurang B. Patil was appointed on 21-10-1985 and he attained the 'temporary status' on 7-3-1986, and his services were terminated on 27-8-1987. So far as Mr. Narhar Shankar is concerned, he was appointed on 22-10-1985, and his services were terminated on 30-6-1987. Mr. Janardan R. was appointed on 9-8-1985, and came to be terminated on 29-6-1987. It is contended that Mr. Shankar and Mr. Janardan were not granted temporary status. All the same, it is seen that they worked for more than a year continuously. If that be so, the termination of their services amounted to retrenchment and if the provisions of section 25F are not complied with, then the termination is bad in law and illegal and therefore void.

8. In this connection section 2(o) can be referred to, which defines retrenchment.

9. Retrenchment means, termination for any reason whatsoever, other than by way of disciplinary action. It does not include voluntary retirement, retirement on attaining the age of superannuation, termination by way of non-renewal of the contract, if the contract of employment contains such a provision, and/or termination of services due to continued ill health.

10. Here, it is not a case of voluntary retirement, nor a case of retirement on attaining the age of superannuation. It is also not a case of expiry of the contract, or a case of continued ill-health. It is true that the management came out with a case that the workmen remained absent very regularly, therefore, their services were terminated. However, no chargesheet was issued to them. There is also no enquiry held and no opportunity given. Therefore, if at all, it is a case of penalty imposed, the same will not be justified. A contention is raised, that the relevant rules do not contemplate any such enquiry and therefore no enquiry was held. I am unable to accept this submission for the simple reason that though temporary status has not been conferred on the workman, under the provisions of para 2511, it will be seen that they had acquired the temporary status, and ought to have been dealt with by following the relevant rules. They have worked right from August 1985, and October 1985 and came to be terminated in June 1987. Para 2501 (B) (i) :

"Staff paid from contingencies except those retained for more than six months continuously—such of those persons who continue to do the same work or other work of the same type for more than six months without a break will be treated as temporary, after the expiry of six months of continuous employment."

It that be so, then those persons would really have acquired the temporary status, because they have been obviously working for more than six months continuously. The Railway Administration will not be therefore, justified in contending that they were not granted the temporary status, and it will surely vitiate the order of termination.

11. An attempt was made on behalf of the Railway Administration to contend that they were not given temporary status, and they remained absent very regularly, therefore, their services came to be terminated. The justification given is in my opinion, not acceptable, because, the management itself has mentioned in the written statement, that Mr. Patli was appointed on 21-10-1985, and he worked continuously till 28-7-1987, Mr. Shankar appointed on 22-10-1985 and came to be terminated on 30-6-1987, and Mr. Janardan R. having appointed on 9-8-1985 continued till 29-6-1987. It is contended that the General Manager's sanction was only for engagement of Casual Labourers for the purpose of track renewal, and not for any other work or for any other department. The workman in the present dispute was engaged by the permanent way Inspector of Andheri vide his letter dated 9-9-1983, and he was holding yellow card bearing No. 105421. He worked under the Permanent Way Inspector Andheri for 87 days between 26-10-1983 and 20-1-1984 and from 21-1-1984 to 4-6-1984 for 132 days with two days broken period. It is then contended that the workman left on his own and was thereafter engaged under the Chief Telecommunications Inspector, under the Signal and Telecommunications Department. What is stated is that, the workman was initially appointed by the PWI—Andheri against the sanction by the General Manager, for the purpose of track renewal work, and thereafter he left the job. It is further stated that there has been a ban on engagement of Casual Labourers, without specific sanction of the General Manager, communicated by letter dated 13-7-1987, inspite of which, he was engaged by the Telecommunications Department. Since this was in contravention of the sanction of the General Manager, his services were terminated. In terms of the letter dated 9-7-1973, the Casual Labourers who have not acquired the status of temporary employees and have not put in one year's continuous services were not entitled to the benefit under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. From the above mentioned particulars of the workman, it will be seen that he has not completed one year continuous service and had also not therefore acquired temporary status. I am unable to see how this contention could be raised in view of the statement made in the written statement by the management itself.

12. However, I find that the workmen had completed continuous service for more than one year as can be seen from the statement of the management, and therefore, the provisions of section 25F would be attracted.

13. In this connection, reference could be usefully made to the decision in the case between Mr. L. Robert D'Souza and Executive Engineer, Southern Railway and another reported in 1982—I LLJ, Page 330. That was a case of a Casual Labourer by name Mr. Robert D'Souza. He joined the services of Southern Railway in July 1948. In course of his services he came to be transferred to various places and finally, while he was working at Ernakulam, in the year 1974, his services were terminated with effect from 18-9-1974 on the ground that he had absented himself from duty. He was intimated by the Railway Authorities, that his services were terminated with effect from the date from which he absented himself. No enquiry was instituted against the delinquent. In this case, it was observed by the Supreme Court, that the termination of the workman Mr. D'Souza amounted to retrenchment because it was not covered by any of the exemptions given under section 2(a) of the Act. The Supreme Court also considered the Indian Railway Establishment Manual, para 2501 which dealt with the conditions of the Casual Labourers. Provisions of section 2505 is with regard to notice of termination. Rule 2301 dealing with the service conditions of Temporary Railway Servants was also considered, and the Supreme Court came to the conclusion that at the time of termination Mr. D'Souza had acquired the status of temporary employee. It is also observed that :

"Once it is held that by operation of statutory rule in the Manual, the appellant had acquired a status of temporary railway servant and assuming, as contended by Mr. Francis, that the termination of service in the circumstances alleged does not constitute retrenchment *stricto sensu*, would the termination be still valid? The answer is an emphatic no. On the admission of the Railway administration, service was terminated on account of absence during the period appellant was on fast. Absence without leave constitutes misconduct and it is not open to the employer to terminate service without notice and enquiry or at any rate without complying with the minimum principle of natural justice. Further, Rule 2302 clearly prescribes the mode, manner and methodology of terminating service of a temporary railway servant and admittedly the procedure therein prescribed having not been carried out, the termination is void and invalid. Accordingly, the same conclusion would be reached even while accepting for the purpose of the facts of this case, simultaneously rejecting it in law, that the termination does not constitute retrenchment yet nonetheless it would be void and inoperative."

14. The Supreme Court also considered the point whether the termination amounted to retrenchment, and held that it did amount to retrenchment, and since it is without following the procedure preceding retrenchment, it was bad. This is what is observed;

"Therefore, assuming that he was a daily-rated worker, once he has rendered continuous uninterrupted service for a period of one year or more, within the meaning of S. 25F of the Act and his service is terminated for any reason whatsoever and the case does not fall in any of the excepted categories, notwithstanding the fact that Rule 2505 would be attracted, it would have to be read subject to the provisions of the Act. Accordingly, the termination of service in this case would constitute retrenchment and for not complying with pre-conditions to valid retrenchment, the order of termination would be illegal and invalid".

In the circumstances, the Supreme Court set aside the order, and directed reinstatement of the workman with full back wages, holding the termination as illegal, invalid, and improper and also awarded Rs. 2,000 towards costs. It is therefore, not necessary to say anything more. Suffice it to say that the workman concerned in the present case had put in more than one year's continuous service, obviously more than 120 days, as result of which, they had attained temporary status, and since no opportunity was given to them by way of notice, there has been violation of the principles

of natural justice, and hence order vitiated. Since the termination amounted to retrenchment, and it is not in accordance with the provisions of law, it is bad in law, unjustified, and improper, as a result, the workmen are said to be in continuous service, and entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and consequential benefits.

15. Award accordingly.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

कां०१०१९६६.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्नाटक बैंक लि० के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, प्रत्यक्ष में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं० 1, बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 20-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12011/81/89-आईआरबीआई]

बो०क० शर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1966.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (17 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Karnataka Bank Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-94

[No L-12011/81/89-I.R.B.I.]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri Justice R. G. Sindhakar, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-17 OF 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Karnataka Bank Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Management : Shri Hegde, Advocate

For the Workmen : Shri Ganguli, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Banking

STATE : Maharashtra.

Bombay, dated the 4th day of July, 1994

AWARD

This reference has been made by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, by letter dated February 13, 1990 to this Tribunal under section 10(1)(d) read with section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the action of the management of Karnataka Bank Ltd., in terminating the services of Smt. Sula-bha Moreshwar Purandare from Bandra Branch of the Bank w.e.f. 31-10-1984 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief she is entitled?"

2. Statement of claim has been filed by Mrs. Purandare. She came to be appointed as Clerk in the services of the

Karnatak Bank Ltd., in December 1971, and was thereafter designated in or about May 1978, as Officer Class III. She maintains that in spite of this, she continued to be a workman and in fact primarily, her duties were clerical, manual, technical and/or of skilled nature, which included ledger checking, balancing, and other writing works. She therefore, is a workman within the meaning of section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short, Act.)

3. She worked in various branch offices of the Bank, and at the relevant time was at Bandra Branch, Bombay. Mr. Satish Rao was the Manager of the branch at the relevant time and she carried out the orders of her superiors, including those of Mr. Satish Rao.

4. The Bandra branch had at the relevant time, 4 accounts of : General Trading Agency, Bharat Corporation, Pukhray & Co., and K. M. Corporation. The Branch Manager had in his capacity and rights given certain overdraft facilities and clearing facilities to these concerns for a long term and when some cheques on these concerns used to come the workman sought the instructions of the Branch Manager, Mr. Satish Rao, and carried out his orders. She was not aware if the Branch Manager had taken instructions of the Head Office in respect of these transactions.

5. In or about April 1982, Mr. Satish Rao, the then Manager of the Bandra branch came to be transferred, and was replaced by one Mr. Udupa. Under the directions from the Head Office, the charge of the branch was handed over to the workman Mrs. Purandare. Though Mr. S. M. Udupa visited the branch on 16-4-1982, he did not take over the charge from the workman, and thus she continued to hold the charge of the Bandra branch till 8-5-1982, when she proceeded on maternity leave. On that day, Mr. Udupa took charge, and relieved her. She maintained that, when she held the charge as a manager of the branch, she continued to perform the clerical duties and also other work of the branch, as per instructions that had been given to her. She further stated that Mr. Satish Rao had instructed her to continue such facilities to the aforesaid customers and in obedience of the orders of her superiors, she did so. The new Branch Manager, Mr. Udupa instructed the workman not to honour the cheques presented by the above mentioned customers and to discontinue the facilities, which they till then enjoyed. In view of the instructions given to her by the new branch manager in the presence of the parties and without giving her any confidential note regarding the same, she accordingly carried out the instructions.

6. While on leave, she received a memo dated 24-6-1982, containing various allegations against her, and by her letter dated 21-7-1982, she replied the same and denied the allegations made against her. She placed the facts on record. The Asstt. General Manager (Inspection Department) visited her house, while she was still on maternity leave and pressurised her to write a letter and date it is 14-6-1982. She further states that she was in a delicate state of health both physically and emotionally and she was confused and vulnerable and taking advantage of these circumstances, the Asstt. General Manager obtained the said self-incriminating letter under duress.

7. Thereafter, she was issued a letter dated 19-11-1982 containing the chargesheet against the workman, making various false allegations (accepting to the workman) that the conduct of the workman was highly prejudicial to the Bank's interest and constituted misconduct. It is her grievance that the said chargesheet did not set out the exact misconduct under the Service Rules applicable to the workman. There was no such misconduct, according to the workman under the service Rules applicable to her as an act prejudicial to the interest of the Bank. She further stated that the chargesheet was vague. The workman hereafter, by letter dated 16-2-1983, replied to the charges levelled against her and placed the correct facts on record.

8. An enquiry against her was held by the Bank after lapse of 15 months and by order dated 16-10-1984, she came to be dismissed from the services of the Bank with effect from 31-10-1984. She contended that the enquiry was not fair and proper, and in gross violation of the principles of natural justice. Crucial and relevant documents were not

produced by the Bank at the time of the enquiry. The Clearing House regulations, which was an important document of which the Bank was in possession was not produced nor did the Enquiry Officer called for the documents demanded by the workman during the course of the enquiry. Findings of the Enquiry Officer are contrary to the material on record and biased and therefore unjustified and bad in law. No misconduct was proved and the Enquiry Officer placed arbitrarily the burden of proving her innocence, rather than calling upon the Bank to prove it. The order of penalty of dismissal from service, contends Mrs. Purandare is purely mechanical and discriminatory and grossly disproportionate to the misconduct alleged much less proved.

9. She therefore, raised an industrial dispute, demanding reinstatement and other consequential benefits. Her demands were not met with and therefore, she sought the intervention of the appropriate Government under section 2A of the Act. The Asstt. Labour Commissioner, however, refused to intervene and therefore, Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, came to be filed in the High Court of Bombay, bearing No. 1964 of 1985. Directions were issued by the High Court by its order dated 19-2-1988 to admit the demands of the workman and dispose of the same in accordance with law. It is thereafter, the present reference came to be made, as a result of the failure report of the Conciliation Officer.

10. The submission is that the action is illegal, arbitrary, and a colourable exercise of mis-utilisation of the powers vested in the authorities and in utter violation of the principles of natural justice. She contended that, even her appeal against the order of dismissal was dismissed arbitrarily and without applying its mind, by the Board of Directors. It is also contended that the Enquiry Officer being a paid officer of the Bank, was biased in favour of the Bank and was expected to hold in favour of the Bank only. No substitute was provided when the original defence representative was out of station during the course of the enquiry. She also mentioned in her statement of claim, that though criminal proceedings have been initiated against the Manager Mr. Satish Rao, he has not been dealt with departmentally and let off without any punishment. The prayer therefore, is that, the impugned order dated 24-10-1984 should be set aside, directing her reinstatement with all other consequential benefits.

11. Written statement has been filed on behalf of the Management, opposing the contentions raised in the statement of claim. It is contended that Mrs. Purandare is not a 'workman' within the meaning of section 2(s) of the Act, and therefore, the present reference is not maintainable. The management also contended that the action was fully justified and was taken after a fair, proper and impartial enquiry which was held into the charges. It was further contended that the penalty was proportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed by the delinquent, and the Appellate Authority also after considering the facts and circumstances, and applying its mind, upheld the order. It is stated that though she was appointed as a clerk, subsequently, she was promoted as an Officer Grade III and there has been communications to that effect submitted by her accepting the promotion. It is further contended that she was enjoying all the facilities applicable to the officers of the Bank. It is submitted that a Power of Attorney was executed in favour of the delinquent Mrs. Purandare by the Bank thereby delegating her various powers. It is further contended that subsequent to the promotion, she joined the Karnataka Bank Officers' Association and it was the General Secretary of that Organisation, who defended the delinquent during the course of the enquiry proceedings.

12. It is at the end, prayed that the present reference be rejected and appropriate judgment be passed in favour of the Bank.

13. Mrs. Purandare has filed a rejoinder to the written statement, and reiterated what has been averred in her statement of claim. It is however, not necessary at this stage to repeat all that over again.

14. On behalf of the Bank, affidavit of Mr. Hebber and evidence of Mrs. Sunita M. Kaund has been adduced. On

behalf of Mrs. Purandare, she has examined herself. Documentary evidence has been also adduced and the arguments advanced on either side have been heard.

15. The points that arise for consideration are whether Mrs. Purandare is a workman within the meaning of section 2(s) of the Act, if so, whether the reference is maintainable, whether the action of the management in dismissing her from the services is justified, if not, what relief she is entitled to?

16. The admitted position is that Mrs. Purandare held the post of Officer Grade III at the relevant time. It is also not disputed that she held charge of the Branch Manager's post. The Bandra branch of the Bank at the relevant time had 4 accounts of General Trading Agencies, Bharat Corporation, Pukhraj Co., and K. M. Corporation. It is the case of the management, that Mrs. Purandare as well as Mr. Satish Rao, in collusion with each other had allowed facilities without any reference to the Head Office of the Bank. The other allegation is that after the transfer of Mr. Satish Rao, while Mrs. Purandare was in-charge of the branch, she continued to provide these facilities, and she also unauthorisedly enhanced the limit upto Rs. 2.5 lakhs. Thereafter on taking charge of the branch by Mr. S. M. Udupa, the new manager, he wanted to put an end to these facilities to the customers, and he issued confidential instructions to Mrs. Purandare, not to honour the cheques of these four customers. Instead of obeying the confidential instructions of the Branch Manager Mr. S. M. Udupa, Mrs. Purandare disclosed the secrets to the customers with ulterior motives. Therefore, she came to be chargesheeted calling upon her to submit her explanation with regard to the facilities provided to these four customers. After receipt of her reply hereto, Enquiry Officer was appointed by the Bank to enquire into the matter. Mr. Hebber, Industrial Relations Officer of the Bank was appointed for that purpose, and he has filed his affidavit. He has stated in his affidavit that he was appointed as Enquiry Officer and that the enquiry conducted was fair and proper, impartial and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. He further contended that Mrs. Purandare was defended by the General Secretary of the Karnataka Bank Officers' Organisation. He further stated that adequate opportunities were given to her as well as her defence representative. He also stated that he had access to all the papers of the Bank. He stated in the course of his cross-examination, that he had visited the Bandra Branch on around 20 occasions. He denied the suggestion, that Mrs. Purandare was doing clerical/manual nature of duties.

17. It is to be noted that Mrs. Purandare has examined herself and in the course of the evidence, she has not stated that she was not defended by the General Secretary of the Officers' Organisation, though she had made a faint allegation in her statement of claim in that behalf. She could not also deny that she was not given reasonable opportunities to defend her case. I find therefore, that there is no merit whatsoever, in her contention that the enquiry was not in accordance with the law and procedure and in gross violation of the principles of natural justice.

18. The Enquiry Officer's findings were submitted to the Disciplinary Authority, and thereafter, the penalty was imposed on her and Mrs. Purandare also does not say that the findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse.

19. The grievance made is that the charges were not specified. I do not find any merit in this contention after reading the charge-sheet.

20. I find that the Enquiry Officer has given her a fair and reasonable opportunity to defend herself, and she was also allowed to cross-examine the witnesses examined on behalf of the Bank management. The letter dated 14-6-1982, addressed by Mrs. Purandare, clearly goes to show that she admitted the charges.

21. I find that there has been a fair and proper enquiry into the charges levelled against her and the findings are based on material on record. It is rather difficult to accept that it is not a case of 'misconduct'. In the circumstances, I find that the action of the management of Karnataka Bank in dismissing Mrs. Purandare from the services of the Bank is just and proper.

22. In the circumstances, even assuming that she was a workman, she will not be entitled to any relief. However, several conventions have been raised on behalf of either side, and authorities have been cited and I shall deal with the same.

23. Various rulings have been referred to and relied upon on behalf of the workman to show that Mrs. Purandare was a workman. Workman has been defined under section 2(s) of the Act. Though, I do not find it necessary to deal with all of them, in view of my above finding on fairness of enquiry I shall mention them briefly.

24. On behalf of Mrs. Purandare, reference has been made to a decision in the case between Syndicate Bank Ltd. and their workmen, reported in 1966, Vol. 2, LLJ, Page 194. Therein, a dispute between the Bank and its employees was referred to the Tribunal. While dealing with the point as to whether the C-Grade Officers of the Bank were workman or not, it was observed that : mere designation of a person not conclusive of his status, as an officer—C Rank drawing wages exceeding Rs. 500/- per mensem not excepted from the category of workmen. It is further observed that, they would be excepted if they are employed mainly for the purpose of carrying out managerial functions or in administrative capacity. Another decision in the case of S. K. Verma applicant and Mahesh Chandra and another respondents, reported in the year 1983, Labour Industrial Cases, Vol. 2, Page 1483, has been relied upon. Therein it is held that the Development Officer of the Life Insurance Corporation of India are workmen within the meaning of section 2(s) of the Act. It is observed therein that :

"The principal duty appears to be to organise and develop the business of the Corporation in the area allotted to him and for that purpose to recruit active and reliable agents to train them, to canvass new business and to render post sale services to policy-holders. He is expected to assist and inspire the agents. Even so he has not the authority to appoint agents or to take disciplinary action against them. He does not even supervise the work of the agents though he is required to train them and assist them. He is to be the 'friend, philosopher and guide' of the agents working within his jurisdiction and no more. He is expected to stimulate and excite the agents to work, while exercising no administrative control over them. The agents are not his subordinates. In fact, it is admitted that he has no subordinate staff working under him. It is thus clear that the development officer cannot by any stretch of imagination be said to be engaged in any administrative or managerial work."

25. Yet another decision of the Supreme Court in the case between Mr. Ved Prakash Gupta appellant, and Delton Cable (I) Pvt. Ltd. respondent, reported in 1984 LIC-I, Page 658, has been relied upon. In the above case, the appellant was a Security Officer in the factory mainly concerned with the security of the factory. Instructions were given to the watchmen working under him for the security of the factory and the property, and he also used to sign the identity cards, issue torch cells etc to the other watchmen. He also used to recommend their cases for loan and advances or promotions etc. However, he had no power to initiate any disciplinary action against them. The same view has been taken by the Supreme Court in this case also holding that the Security Officer was no doubt a workman within the meaning of section 2(s) of the Act.

26. In a later decision reported in 1985, Part 2, LIC in the case between Arkal Govindarai Rao and Ciba Geigy Ltd. The Supreme Court observed that :—

"Where an employee has multifarious duties and a question is raised whether he is a workman or some one other than a workman the Court must find out what are the primary and basic duties of the person concerned and if he is incidentally asked to do some other work, may not necessarily be in tune with the basic duties these additional duties cannot change the character and status of the person concerned. In other words, the dominant purpose of employment must be first taken into consideration and the

gloss of some additional duties must be rejected while determining the status and character of the person. The definition of the expression workman clearly shows that the person concerned would not cease to be a workman if he performs some supervisory duties but he must be a person who must be engaged in a supervisory capacity."

The management raised preliminary objection and evidence was led by both the parties, and also numerous documents were examined, and the Labour Court came to the conclusion, that the employee was not a workman, and in the Writ Petition filed the High Court came to be dismissed and therefore, the employee filed an appeal by special leave. The Supreme Court observed that :—

"Broadly accepting the appreciation of evidence and the findings of facts recorded by the trial Court, could it be said that the conclusion reached by drawing impermissible inference from the evidence would justify a finding that the appellant was not a workman within the meaning of the expression 'workman' in the Act. The expression workman is defined in S. 2 of the Act as under :—

"workman" means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person—

- (i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1956 (62 of 1957); or
- (ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison ; or
- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity ; or
- (iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature."

27. In an earlier decision in the case between Shri Singh H. S. and Labour Court Coimbatore and another, reported in 1969, LLJ-II, Page 370, also, the same view has been taken while dealing with a question whether the employee concerned was a workman or not.

28. So also the decision in the case between Anand Bazar Patrika and its workman, reported in 1969 LLJ-II, Page 670, the procedure that is expected to be followed, is, whether a particular employee has been appointed to perform duties mainly of supervisory nature or not.

29. The authority in the case between the Guest Keen Williams Ltd., appellant, Vs. Asst. Labour Commissioner, Government of West Bengal and others respondents, reported in 1986—II LIC—page 1668 is, with regard to an agreement between the management and the employees that the employees are officers and not workmen. It was held by the Calcutta High Court in that case, that such an agreement will not be valid, and even then the employees were not exempted from contending that they are workman, if the conditions of services of such employees shall bring them within the definition of workman under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

30. On behalf of the management a decision reported in 1954-LLJ—II page 457 has been relied upon. There in that case also, it has been laid down that in deciding whether a particular employee is workman or not, his designation does not matter, and it is the duties that are performed by him which matters. If his duties are mainly of clerical or manual nature then he must be held to be 'workman' within the meaning of section 2(s) of the Act. The question whether he exercised supervision direction or control gives

only a negative test of a workman, which could not be conclusive.

31. The position obtaining from all these decisions referred to above is that, it is the actual nature of duties performed by the employee, which decides the issue whether an employee is a workman or not, and not his mere designation.

32. In the present case, the management has produced a copy of the power of attorney executed in favour of Mrs. Purandare, which is at Exhibit M-4, and it is dated 24-5-1978. It mentions that the powers given to Mrs. Purandare, and it is an admitted position, that, she worked in grade-III officers' cadre, till her services came to be terminated by the impugned order. Shri Hebbar has supported the contention of the management in this connection by filing an affidavit on behalf of the management of Karnataka Bank Ltd. It is he who was preparing the accounts/statements etc. which were being examined by Mrs. Purandare. Mrs. Kaund, another witness examined on behalf of the management also adduced evidence in support of the contention of the management. She stated that she was working under Mrs. Purandare, and her work was directly supervised by Mrs. Purandare.

33. Document at Exhibit M-21, is the duty list, and it goes to show that Mrs. Purandare performed duties mainly of supervisory nature, such as checking S. B. Accounts, Bills payable and C. D. Accounts, Daily cash etc.

34. During the course of the cross-examination of Mrs. Purandare, she was asked whether she had at any time sanctioned the leave of any of her subordinates. Though she answered in the negative, in the light of the documents produced on record at Exhibit M-22 and 25, they are leave applications of Mr. Bhaskar Suka Chowdhri, attender, dated 17-9-1983, and 22-5-1982, her statement cannot be accepted. It is therefore clear from the evidence adduced on behalf of the management, that she was performing duties mainly of the nature of supervisory, and that she had the power to sanction leave etc., and therefore, she is not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Act. As I have already observed, the management has observed the principles of natural justice, and there has a fair and proper enquiry into the charges levelled against her, in accordance with the provisions of law, and therefore, she will not be entitled to any relief under the present reference. The action of the management of Karnataka Bank Limited, in terminating the services of Smt. Sulabha Moreshwar Purandare, is just and proper and in any event, she would not be entitled to the relief asked for.

Award accordingly, no order as to costs.

R. G. SINDHAKAR, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 18, जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1967.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बम्बे पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंधम निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण न. 2, बम्बे के पचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-07-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन-31011/16/92-आईआर (विविध)]

श्री. एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1994

S.O. 1967.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-07-1994.

[No. 1-31011/16/92-IR(Misc.)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri S. B. Panse, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/22 OF 1993

Employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri M. B. Anchan Advocate.

For the Workmen : 1. Shri T. Srinivasan. 2. Shri G. K. Mehendale Representatives.

INDUSTRY : Ports & Docks STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 30th June, 1994

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by its Order No. 1-31011/16/92-IR (Misc) dated 2-3-1993 referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

"Whether the action of the management of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay in denying to grant of 20 per cent of pay as compensation for performance of additional duties to S/Shri G. K. Mohendale, permanent Way Inspector, and Shri S. H. Kelshikar, Chief permanent Way Inspector for discharging additional duties from April 1988 while other official v/z S/Shri A. S. Kulkarni and G. S. Mattekar were earlier granted to perform additional duties of Chief personnel and Industrial Relations Manager is just, proper and legal ? If not, to what relief are these two employees entitled ?"

2. After receipt of the Reference the parties were served with notices.

3. Bombay Port Trust Technical Supervisory Staff Association on behalf of G. K. Mehendale and S. H. Kelshikar filed a statement of claim on 26-4-1993.

4. The matter was adjourned for filing written statement by the management, but the General Secretary of the Union at Exh. W/5 and W/6 filed purshises informing that the Chair man of the Trust agreed to consider the case of G. K. Mehendale and they do not want to proceed with the Reference. The management informed by purshis Exh. M/7 that Union has decided to withdraw the Reference and it may be disposed of.

5. As the purshises were referring to the claim of Mehendale again the Union was asked what they have to say regarding the claim of Mr. Kelshikar. Today a purshis (Exh. W/8) was filed by the General Secretary informing the court that the management paid Rs. 8,060/- instead of Rs. 9,000/- to Mr. Mehendale. It is further mentioned that the Association does not wish to press the issue in regard to the other workman Shri S. H. Kelshikar.

6. In view of the earlier purshises and the purshis which is filed today nothing remain to be decided in this matter. The reference has to be disposed of as not pressed. Hence I pass the following Award.

AWARD

The Reference is disposed of as not pressed. No order as to costs.

S. B. PANSE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का.आ. 1968.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दरीबा कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जयपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-07-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन-43012/1/87-डी.आई. (बी)]

बी.एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1968.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dariba Copper Project and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 21-07-94.

[No. L-43012/1/87-DI(B)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

अनुबंध

केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण जयपुर

केस नं. 2 सी.आई.टी. 59/1987

रैफरेंस: केन्द्र सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली का आदेश क्रमांक एल-43012/1/87 डी.आई. (बी) दिनांक 18-8-1987

महासचिव, कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट मजदूर यूनियन, अलवर।

—प्रार्थी

बनाम

प्रोजेक्ट मैनेजर, दरीबा कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट, अलवर

—अप्रार्थी

उपस्थित

माननीय न्यायाधीश श्री शंकर लाल जैन, आर.एच.जे.एस.

प्रार्थी यूनियन की ओर से: श्री वीरेन्द्र सिंह यादव

अप्रार्थी की ओर से: श्री मनोज शर्मा

दिनांक अर्वाई: 17 जनवरी, 1994

अर्वाई

केन्द्र सरकार ने अपने उपरोक्त आदेश के जरिए निम्न विवाद इस न्यायाधिकरण को वास्ते अधिनिर्णय औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947, जिसे तत्पश्चात अधिनियम संशोधित किया है, की धारा 10(1)(घ) के अन्तर्गत प्रेषित किया है: "क्या दरीबा कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट, अलवर के प्रबंधन के श्री भोलाराम, खनिक को माईनिंग मेट के रूप में पदोन्नति न करने तथा 23-5-85 को हुए साक्षात्कार के परिणाम की घोषणा न करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

2. कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट मजदूर यूनियन, जिसे तत्पश्चात प्रार्थी संघ संशोधित किया है, ने जरिये ब्लेस प्रकट किया कि श्रमिक भोलाराम की नियुक्ति 15 वर्ष पूर्व माईनिंग मेट के पद पर अप्रार्थी संस्थान द्वारा की गई थी और दिनांक 1-10-83 के उपरान्त से उसे माईनिंग मेट के पद का कार्य करने के लिए नियोजक ने अधिकृत किया हुआ था और उक्त कार्य के लिए एक प्रमाण पत्र भी नियोजक ने जारी किया था परन्तु उसे माईनिंग मेट का वेतन न दिया जाकर कार्यवाहक भत्ता ही दिया गया। प्रार्थी संघ का कहना है कि श्रमिक भोलाराम माईनिंग मेट का कार्य करने के लिए योग्यता रखता है। दिनांक 10-1-85 को नियोजक ने एन सरकूलर जारी किया जिसके द्वारा विभागीय अभ्याथियों द्वारा उक्त पद को भरने के लिए आवेदन पत्र मांगे, जिनके लिए भोलाराम ने भी दिनांक 23-1-85 को आवेदन किया और उसे 23-5-85 को साक्षात्कार के लिए बुलाया गया। उस रोज भोलाराम के अगवा तीन अन्य विभागीय अभ्याथियों का भी साक्षात्कार हुआ। प्रार्थी संघ कहता है कि दसवीं कक्षा उत्तीर्ण था तथा माईनिंग सर्टिफिकेट धारी था और वह साक्षात्कार में उत्तीर्ण हुआ था परन्तु फिर भी नियोजक ने श्री भोलाराम को माईनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नत नहीं किया क्योंकि उक्त श्रमिक प्रार्थी संघ का सक्रिय सदस्य था इसलिए उसे विक्तिमाईज किया गया। चूंकि भोलाराम ने माईनिंग मेट का कार्य नियोजक के द्वारा अधिकृत करने पर किया है इसलिए उसे माईनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नत नहीं किया जाना न्यायोचित नहीं है तथा दिनांक 23-5-85 को साक्षात्कार का नतीजा घोषित नहीं किया जाना भी न्यायोचित नहीं है अतः प्रार्थना की कि उसे दिनांक 1-10-83 से ही माईनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नत घोषित किया जावे और तभी से उसे उक्त पद के समस्त लाभ व वेतन दिलाये जावे तथा साक्षात्कार का परिणाम भी घोषित किया जावे।

3. अप्रार्थी नियोजक ने जरिये प्रत्युत्तर प्रकट किया कि भोलाराम को प्रारंभ में जूनियर मिलमैन के पद पर नियुक्त किया गया था तत्पश्चात् उसे माईनिंग मेट के पद पर आवेदन किया गया। भोलाराम को कभी भी माईनिंग मेट का कार्य करने का प्रमाण पत्र जारी नहीं किया गया था और भोलाराम ने माईनिंग मेट के छुट्टी पर जाने की अवधि में ही माईनिंग मेट/माईनिंग सुपरवाइजर के पद का कार्य किया है। नियोजक का कहना है कि उक्त अधिकृत पत्र भी गलती से भोलाराम को जारी किया गया था क्योंकि उक्त अधिकृत पत्र केवल उन्हीं व्यक्तियों को जारी किया जा सकता है जिनके पास माईनिंग मेट का प्रमाणपत्र हो। नियोजक यह भी कहता है कि माईनिंग मेट का कार्य करने की योग्यता रखने मात्र से ही कोई व्यक्ति उक्त पद को पदोन्नति का हकदार नहीं बनता बल्कि किसी भी पद पर पदोन्नति तो "रिक्तमेन्ट एंड प्रमोशन रूलम्" के अन्तर्गत ही की जा सकती है। नियोजक यह स्वीकार करता है कि माईनिंग सुपरवाइजर पद के लिए साक्षात्कार दिया गया था जिसमें दिनांक 23-5-85 को भोलाराम ने भी साक्षात्कार दिया था परन्तु उसका नतीजा

घोषित नहीं किया गया क्योंकि चयन समिति का मत था कि योग्य अभ्यर्थियों का ट्रेड टेस्ट लिया जावे जा टेस्ट 10-9-85 को लिया गया था, उक्त ट्रेड टेस्ट के लिए श्री भोलाराम योग्य नहीं थे। दिनांक 17-9-86 को पुनः ट्रेड टेस्ट लिया गया जिसमें केवल रामनारायण ही एक योग्य अभ्यर्थी था क्योंकि उसके पास मार्डनिंग मेट का प्रमाण पत्र था तथा वह "क्रिकेटमैट एंड प्रोमोशन रूलस" के अन्तर्गत पदोन्नति के लिए योग्य था। इसलिए उक्त पद के लिए रामनारायण का चयन कर लिया गया। नियोजक का कहना है कि भोलाराम को विक्टिमाइज करने जैसी उनकी कोई नियत नहीं थी। अतः प्रार्थी संघ अथवा भोलाराम किसी राहत के अधिकारी नहीं है इसलिए क्लेम खारिज किया जावे।

4. यह उल्लेखनीय है कि यह रेफरेंस इस न्यायाधिकरण में वर्ष 1987 में प्राप्त हुआ था तथा पक्षकारों की साक्ष्य एवं पक्षकारों के प्रतिनिधिगण की ब्रह्म सुनने के उपरांत इस न्यायाधिकरण द्वारा उपरोक्त निर्देश में दिनांक 25-3-91 को अवार्ड पारित करते हुए यह आदेश दिया था कि "प्रत्येक दृष्टिकोण से परखने पर मेरी राय में यह श्रमिक मार्डनिंग मेट के पद पर प्रमोशन का अधिकारी नहीं होता है और दिनांक 23-5-85 के साक्षात्कार का नतीजा घोषित करने पर भी उसे कोई लाभ नहीं मिलता है, इसलिए यह श्रमिक किसी राहत का अधिकारी नहीं है।" उपरोक्त न्यायाधिकरण के आदेश से दुखी होकर प्रार्थी यूनियन ने माननीय उच्च न्यायालय से रिट याचिका दाखल की। उक्त रिट याचिका एम.बी. मिबिल रिट पिटीशन नं. 2746/91 को स्वीकार करते हुए माननीय न्यायाधिपति श्री जी.एस. सिंघवी द्वारा दिनांक 18-6-93 को यह आदेश दिये गये हैं कि केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण, जयपुर द्वारा पारित अवार्ड दिनांक 25-3-91 को अपास्त किया जाता है एवं इस निर्देश को दुबारा न्याय निर्णय हेतु रिमाण्ड कर केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण को भेजा गया है। आदेश में यह भी कहा गया है कि न्यायाधिकरण उक्त निर्देश का निर्णय करते समय माननीय उच्च न्यायालय द्वारा दिनांक 18-6-93 को पारित आदेश में दिये गये "ओब्जरवेशन्स" का ध्यान में रखते हुए फसला दें।

5. माननीय उच्च न्यायालय के निर्देशानुसार दोनों पक्षों को प्रलेख तथा शपथ पत्र एवं साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत करने के समुचित अवसर दिये गये तथा अभिलेख पर उपलब्ध प्रलेख तथा माननीय उच्च न्यायालय में प्रस्तुत किये गये प्रलेखों एवं इस न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष प्रस्तुत किये गये प्रलेखों, साक्ष्य, शहान्त एवं समस्त सामग्री पर पुनर्विचार किया गया, एवं दोनों पक्षों के प्रतिनिधियों का धर्मपूर्वक सुना गया तथा विधि के सुसंगत प्रावधानों का ध्यानपूर्वक परिशीलन किया गया।

6. प्रबंधन के विद्वान प्रतिनिधि के न्याय दूरान्त जे.टी. 1993(6) (एम.सी. 1593, जे. एंड के. पब्लिक वर्कस कमीशन बनाम डा. नरेन्द्र मोहन व अन्य, मिबिल अपील नं. 7249/93 निर्णय दिनांक 7-12-93 का आशय लेते हुए यह प्रबल दलील दी कि श्रमिक भोला राम खहनक को

मार्डनिंग मेट के रूप में नियमों के अनुसार पदोन्नति नहीं दी जा सकती थी क्योंकि श्रमिक मार्डनिंग मेट के प्रमोशन पब चनल में नहीं आता है।

7. प्रबंधन के विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्री एम.के. शर्मा ने यह भी दलील दी कि श्रमिक का समय समय पर मार्डनिंग मेट के पद के लिए प्रबंधन द्वारा अधिकृत किया जाना भी अनुचित एवं अर्थात् था क्योंकि उक्त कार्यवाही "हार्डशिड प्रोसीजर" के अन्तर्गत आती है और इसके आधार पर श्रमिक को कोई अधिकार प्राप्त नहीं होता।

8. श्रमिक के विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्री यादव ने यह दलील दी कि श्रमिक पदोन्नति किये जाने की योग्यता रखता है और उसे समय समय पर प्रबंधन ने मार्डनिंग मेट के रूप में कार्य करने हेतु अधिकृत भी किया था और उसे नियमों के अनुसार मार्डनिंग मेट के रूप में पदोन्नति दी जा सकती है। श्री यादव ने यह प्रबल दलील दी कि प्रबंधन का यह कथन स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं है कि मार्डनिंग मेट तथा मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर एक ही पद हो, क्योंकि उक्त दोनों ही पद अलग-अलग हैं।

9. श्रमिक के विद्वान प्रतिनिधि को एक दलील यह भी थी कि प्रबंधन को यह कथन भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं है कि मार्डनर से ब्लास्टर सशोधित और ब्लास्टर से मार्डनिंग मेट पदोन्नति का चैनल था।

10. प्रबंधन के साक्षी श्री जगदीश लाल ने यह स्वीकार किया है कि श्रमिक भोला राम कुशल श्रमिक है और प्रबंधन द्वारा उसको नियुक्ति 1-7-74 को की गई थी तब से लगातार 20 वर्ष की अवधि व्यतीत होने के बावजूद भी उसे पदोन्नति नहीं दी गई है। श्रमिक ने अपने शपथ पत्र में 21 प्रलेखों का उल्लेख किया है जिसे इस साक्षी ने सही होना माना है। उसने यह भी स्वीकार किया है कि दिनांक 8-9-83 के पहले परियोजना में चार मार्डनिंग मेट कार्य करते थे जिनका नाम शिवाजी प्रसाद, जगदीश जोशी, ए.बी. मजूमदार व अम्भू बनान शर्मा हैं जिनमें से जगदीश जोशी की पदोन्नति फॉर्मन के पद पर मितम्बर 1983 में हुई थी तथा श्री मजूमदार की भी पदोन्नति हो गई थी। यह उल्लेखनीय है कि प्रबंधन के साक्षी श्री जगदीश लाल ने अपने प्रतिपरीक्षण में इस तथ्य को स्वीकार किया है कि श्रमिक भोला राम को मार्डनिंग मेट का कार्य करने के लिए समय-समय पर अधिकृत किया गया था और उसने प्रलेख प्रदर्ण डब्बू-1 को भी मही होना माना है। इस प्रकार प्रबंधन का यह दलील स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं है कि श्रमिक को मार्डनिंग मेट के पद पर कार्य करने के लिए अनुचित व अवैध तरीके से अधिकृत किया गया हो। यह प्रक्रिया हार्डशिड प्रोसीजर में नहीं आती।

11. प्रबंधन के साक्षी श्री जगदीश लाल ने यह कथन किया है कि 75 प्रतिशत पद पदोन्नति में तथा 25 प्रति

पद सीधी भर्ती से भरने के नियम हैं हिंदुस्तान कॉपर लि. मैमोरेण्डम ग्राफ एग्जीक्यूटिव रीचर्ड एट कलकत्ता ब्राउन् 23-3-80 के अर्नैक्सचर-7 में "एक्टिंग अर्नैक्सचर" का प्रावधान है जिसके तहत श्रमिक को उच्च पद पर कार्य करने के लिए नियमानुसार अधिकृत किया जा सकता है और इस मामले में भी समय-समय पर श्रमिक को मार्डनिंग मेट के पद पर कार्य करने के लिए अधिकृत किया गया था यह एक निर्विवाद तथ्य है।

12. प्रबंधन का यह कथन भी स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं है कि मार्डनिंग मेट एवं मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर का एक ही पद हो क्योंकि ये दोनों अलग-अलग पद हैं और दोनों पदों के लिए अलग-अलग वेतन शृंखलाएं निर्धारित की हुई हैं। श्रमिक भोला राम ने अपने कथन से यह प्रमाणित किया है कि मार्डनिंग मेट का वेतनमान टी-8 (595-30-955) रिवाइज्ड 1-9-93 में (795-41-1328) और मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर का वेतन टी-9 है (655-35-1075) रिवाइज्ड 1-9-83 (865-48-1489) है। विपक्षी की ओर से श्रमिक की इस साक्ष्य का कोई खंडन नहीं हुआ है। प्रबंधन के साथी श्री जगदीश लाल ने मृत्युता को छुपाने का प्रयास किया है। उसने यह कथन किया है कि उसने मार्डनिंग मेट टी-8 वेतन शृंखला में हो तो उसे याद नहीं। सुपरवाइजर का वेतनमान यही था। उसने कथन किया है कि यह गलत है कि मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर का वेतन टी-9 हो।

13. अर्नैक्सचर-2 प्रदर्श-10 में भी यही प्रमाणित होता है कि मार्डनिंग मेट के लिए टी-8 तथा सुपरवाइजर के लिए वेतन शृंखला 9 पूर्व में निर्धारित की हुई थी। मार्डनिंग मेट के पद के लिए सीधी भर्ती हेतु विपक्षी द्वारा विज्ञापन क्रमांक 1/85 दिनांक 10-10-85 प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू-23 निकाला गया था जिसके लिए प्रार्थी भोला राम ने भी आवेदन पत्र भेजा था। इस संबंध में उसे साक्षात्कार हेतु पत्र प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू-5 विपक्षी द्वारा भेजा गया था जिसमें मार्डनिंग मेट को रिवाइज्ड वेतन शृंखला 795-41-1328 दर्ज है। इस प्रकार यह प्रमाणित हो जाता है कि मार्डनिंग मेट व मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर के विपक्षी संस्थान में अलग अलग पद हैं और दोनों ही पदों के लिए अलग-अलग वेतनमान निर्धारित हैं। विपक्षी की यह साक्ष्य भरोसा किये जाने योग्य नहीं है कि मार्डनिंग मेट मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर एक ही पद हो विपक्षी के ग्रा. एंड पी. नियम बने हुए हैं इसमें मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर को क्रमांक 21 पर दर्शित किया गया है और इसके लिए लेबल सल्वार ब्लेस्टर को चैनल रखा गया है किंतु इन नियमों के अधीन मार्डनिंग मेट के लिए कोई चैनल निर्धारित नहीं है। इस प्रकार विपक्षी का यह कथन स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य नहीं है कि मार्डनिंग मेट के लिए भी लेबल सरदार अथवा ब्लेस्टर का ही चैनल निर्धारित हो। इस प्रकार श्रमिक भोला राम को नियमानुसार ही मार्डनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नति पाने हेतु कोई प्रतिबंध नहीं था।

14. अभिलेख पर उपलब्ध प्रालंबा एव जवाना साक्ष्य का ध्यानपूर्वक मूल्यांकन करने के पश्चात मैं इस निष्कर्ष

पर पहुंचा हूं कि श्रमिक भोला राम को मार्डनिंग मेट के पद पर नियमानुसार पदोन्नत करने के लिए कोई प्रतिबंध नहीं था और वह मार्डनिंग मेट के पद के लिए पूर्ण योग्यता रखता था/है। विपक्षी ने उक्त दिनांक 1-10-83 के पश्चात मार्डनिंग मेट का कार्य करने के लिए समय-समय पर अधिकृत भी किया था और उसने उक्त पद पर 1-10-83 से कार्य किया है। विपक्षी के यहां मार्डनिंग मेट का पद रिक्त था और इस मामले में श्रमिक का साक्षात्कार भी लिया गया था। अर्नैक्सचर-16 दिनांक 15-1-92 विपक्षी द्वारा दिये गये प्रमाण पत्र से भी यह प्रमाणित है कि श्रमिक भोला राम 27-12-79 में दरोवाकापर मार्डिन्स में मार्डनर की हैसियत से कार्य करता था और अर्नैक्सचर 17 से यह भी प्रमाणित हुआ है कि उसने मार्डनिंग मेट की परीक्षा में गफलत प्राप्त की थी जो प्रमाण-पत्र 15 जनवरी 1983 को विपक्षी द्वारा जारी किया गया है? जनवरी 1985 में मार्डनिंग मेट की पोस्ट के लिए योग्यता दर्शाते हुए श्रमिक ने अर्नैक्सचर-18 प्रमाण पत्र दिया था जो विपक्षी को 5-2-85 को प्राप्त हुआ। यह निर्विवाद तथ्य है कि प्रबंधन द्वारा श्रमिक भोला राम का साक्षात्कार मार्डनिंग मेट के रूप में पदोन्नति हेतु 23-5-85 को लिया गया था। विपक्षी के साथी जगदीश-लाल ने अपने शपथ पत्र में यह स्वीकार किया है कि 23-5-85 को मार्डनिंग मेट के पद हेतु साक्षात्कार हुआ था जिसमें श्रमिक भोला राम को भी बुलाया गया था जो सभी आवश्यकताएं रखता था। चयन समिति ने साक्षात्कार के बाद चयन नहीं किया क्योंकि ट्रेड टेस्ट नहीं हुआ था। इस साक्षी ने यह भी कथन किया है कि राम नारायण को मार्डनिंग मेट का पद पर पदोन्नति करने के कारण बाद में भोला राम को इस पद पर कार्य करने हेतु अधिकृत करने की आवश्यकता नहीं रही। श्री राम नारायण का तो बाद में ट्रेड टेस्ट लिया गया था किंतु वह उत्तीर्ण नहीं हुआ इस कारण सीधी भर्ती से पदों को भरने का विज्ञापन निकाला गया। किंतु सीधी भर्ती पर रोक होने के कारण इन पदों को पदोन्नति द्वारा भरने का निर्णय 1986 में लिया गया और पुनः राम नारायण ब्लेस्टर को ट्रेड टेस्ट से ले लिया गया किंतु भोला राम के नाम पर इस कारण विचार नहीं किया गया कि मार्डनिंग मेट पदोन्नति के चैनल में नहीं आता था। विपक्षी को यह साक्ष्य भरोसा करने योग्य नहीं है कि भोला राम मार्डनिंग मेट के पद के लिए पूर्ण योग्यता नहीं रखता था। मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर के लिए लेबल सरदार व ब्लेस्टर का चैनल निहित है किंतु मार्डनिंग मेट के लिए नियमों में इस तरह का कोई चैनल निर्धारित नहीं है। जबकि भोला राम इस पद पर अधिकार पत्र के आधारे पर दिनांक 1-10-83 से कार्य कर रहा था उसे समय-समय पर इस पद पर कार्य करने हेतु अधिकृत किया गया था जैसा कि मैं ऊपर निर्धारित कर चुका हूं कि मार्डनिंग मेट की वेतन शृंखला टी-8 थी जबकि मार्डनिंग सुपरवाइजर की वेतन शृंखला टी-9 थी, इस प्रकार ये दोनों ही अलग-अलग पद हैं। श्री भोला राम ने ऊपर में पूर्ण पृष्ठ की है।

[भाग II—खंड 3(ii)]

भारत का राजपत्र. प्रगण 13, 1994/श्रावण 22, 1916

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 24 OF 1992

(CENTRAL)

Dated, Bhubaneswar, the 30th June, 1994

BETWEEN

The Management of M/s. Jagannath Area of South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. (now Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd.), At/P.O.-Dera Colliery, Talcher, Dist. : Dhenkanal.

.. First party-management.

AND

Their workman Sri B. N. Pani, represented through Bharatpur Colliery Labour Union (HMS), At/P.O. South Balanda, Dist. : Dhenkanal.

.. Second party Workman.

Appearances :

Sri S. C. Panda, Manager (Personnel).—For the party-management.

Sri B. N. Pani.—The workman himself.

AWARD

The reference under consideration reads as hereunder :—

"Whether the action of the management i.e., the General Manager, Jagannath Area of S.E.C. Ltd., Talcher in reducing the rank of Shri B. N. Pani from Legal Inspector (Tr.) to Sr. Accounts Clerk w.e.f. 27-1-90 and confirming the period of suspension from 2-5-89 to 27-1-90 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide their Order No. I-22012(486)/91-IR(C.II) dated—have forwarded the above quoted reference in exercise of the power u/s 10(1)(d) read with Section 10(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'The Act').

3. The General Manager @ Chief General Manager, South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. (presently known as Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd.), Talcher is the first party and hereinafter referred to as 'The management'. Sri B. N. Pani is the second party and hereinafter referred to as 'The workman'.

4. The substance of the facts involved in the case is that on 30-4-89 the workman while working as Legal Inspector (Trainee) was also functioning as the General Secretary of the Bharatpur Colliery Labour Union (for short 'The Union'). On that date there was some commotion at the time office of the management. The workers of the management had congregated with a demand to give compensation to an injured workman who on the previous day had sustained injuries which was caused by a truck inside the Mines premises at a time when he was returning from the mines. The subordinate officers requested the workers to go to their work site and to join in duty and thereafter the management would consider the matter relating to payment of compensation as per the Rules but the workers did not desist from their demand. At that time the workman arrived there and joined in the chorus alongwith other labourers. In view of that tense situation the Project Officer was informed about the situation. After his arrival he made it clear that the injured labourer was not entitled for compensation for the injury. The workers congregated there demanded for their security. The Project Officer also commented on that which was not palatable to the workers. Hence, they shouted to assault him and the workman, as alleged, also abetted them (the labourers) in that respect as a consequence of which the Project Officer was physically assaulted and man-handled. Thus, the aforesaid conduct of the workman was found to be an act of gross indiscipline under different headings and he was asked to show-cause. The explanation furnished by the workman was treated as not satisfactory and a domestic enquiry was conducted against him. The charges were under five headings.

15. तथ्यों और विविधी के उपरोक्त समस्त विवेचन के आधार पर इस निर्देश का अधिनियम निम्न प्रकार किया जाता है :—

दगीश कापर प्रोजेक्ट, झलवर के प्रबंधन की श्री भोला राम खनिज को मारिनिंग मेट के रूप में पदोन्नति न करने तथा 23-5-85 को हुए साक्षात्कार के परिणाम को धोपना न करने का कार्यवाई न्यायचित नहीं है। श्रमिक भोला राम मारिनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नत किये जाने हेतु समस्त योग्यता रखता है अतः जिस तारीख से श्री रामनारायण को मारिनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नति दी गई है उसी तारीख से प्रार्थी भोला राम की मारिनिंग मेट के पद पर पदोन्नति पाने का अधिकारी है। विपक्षी को निर्देश दिये जाते हैं कि प्रार्थी भोला राम को मारिनिंग मेट के पद पर उसी दिनांक से पदोन्नत करने के आदेश प्रदान करें और समस्त वेतन का अन्तर व अन्य लाभ अंदर तीन माह अदा करें।"

16. उक्त आणय का अवार्ड पारित किया जाता है जो केन्द्र सरकार को प्रकाशनार्थ अन्तर्गत धारा 17(1) अधिनियम भेजा जावे।

शंकर लाल जैन, पीठासीन अधिकारी

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1969.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जगन्नाथ एरिया आफ एम.ई.सी.एल. के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, भुवनेश्वर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012/486/91 आई आर सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1994

S.O 1969.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jagannath Area of S.E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-7-1994.

[No. L-22012/486/91-IR(C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : ORISSA : BHUBANESWAR

Present :

Sri P. K. Tripathy, M.A.L.L.B.,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

The Enquiring Officer found the charge Nos. 1, 3 and 5 proved, charge No. 2 partially proved and charge No. 4 not proved and accordingly, submitted his report. On consideration of that report the workman was inflicted with the punishment of reversion to the previous grade i.e., Sr. Accounts Clerk from which he had been promoted to the post of Legal Inspector. Simultaneously, the period of suspension was treated as such and he was warned to guard against such misconduct. The workman filed an appeal but the same was dismissed. In the meantime the workman approached the Labour machinery of the Central Government and as a consequence of that the aforesaid reference has been forwarded when there was a failure at the conciliation.

The workman in his claim statement has challenged the validity of the departmental enquiry on the ground that there was no legal sanction behind it. He has challenged the competency of the authorities who proceeded against him and inflicted the punishment. He has complained of violation of the principle of natural justice by not supplying a copy of the enquiry report to him and not hearing him before considering the question of punishment. He has also taken the same ground of not providing him with a copy of the enquiry report at the appropriate stage as a result of which he could not prefer the appeal in time before the Appellate authority. He challenges the dismissal order passed by the authority as bad in law because of a non-speaking order passed. He has also disputed the allegations covered by the charges and contended that he reached at the spot on the request of the Officers of the Colliery to subside the situation and he has not instigated any of the workers to behave in any manner against the discipline and decorum of the administration.

5. The management in its written statement has taken the stand that the allegations contained in the charges are true and correct, the authority passing the disciplinary order has the competency and jurisdiction, the order of the Appellate authority is not bad in law, the procedure of law relating to initiation and disposal of the departmental enquiry as per the law and Standing Order of the management were correctly followed and there is no violation of the principle of natural justice in any manner. The management has further stated that the acts alleged against the workman proving his misconduct is so glaring that the punishment awarded should be considered as just and proper.

6. On the basis of the aforesaid legal and factual controversy between the parties, the following issues have been settled for adjudication of the reference :—

Issues

- (1) If the action of the management i.e., General Manager, Jagannath Area of S.E.C. Ltd., Talcher in reducing the rank of Sri B. N. Pani from Legal Inspector (Tr.) to Sr. Accounts Clerk w.e.f. 27-1-90 and confirming the period of suspension from 2-5-89 to 27-1-90 is justified ?
- (2) To what relief the workman is entitled to ?
- (3) Is the domestic enquiry conducted against the second party-workman fair and proper ?

7. To substantiate its case, the management has examined three witnesses viz., Sri P. K. Sinha, Sr. Mining Engineer (M.W. 1); Sri U. S. Upadhyay, presently Project Officer (M.W. 2) and Sri Sk. Rahmat Ullah (M.W. 3), presently General Manager but on the date of incident he was the Project Officer. Of the aforesaid three witnesses, M.Ws. 1 and 2 are said to be the eye witnesses to the occurrence and M.W. 3 is the victim. The management has not tendered in evidence any documentary evidence and as such, no document has been marked as exhibit on behalf of the management. On the other hand, the workman was examined himself as the solitary witness from his side. On his behalf four documents have been marked as exhibits A to D. It may be noted here that Ext. A is the initial appointment order of the workman, Ext. B is the office order mentioning that the workman besides other were promoted and posted as Legal Inspector (Trainee), Ext. C is a xerox copy of the charge and Ext. D is the order of the authority inflicting punishment to the workman.

8. The additional issue i.e., Issue No. 3 as noted above relates to the fairness of the domestic enquiry. In that connection, though various contentions, as aforesaid, were raised by the workman but in his evidence he has admitted that he was afforded with proper opportunity to defend his case when the enquiry officer conducted the departmental enquiry. Under such circumstance, the fairness of the enquiry need not be examined till the stage of submission of the enquiry report by the Enquiring Officer.

9. Relying upon the decisions reported in A.I.R. 1969 SC page 1294 (State of Gujarat Vrs. R. G. Teredesai and another) and at page 1302 (State of Maharashtra Vrs. Bhaishankar Avalram Joshi and another); AIR 1991 SC page-471X=1991 (I) LLJ page-1 (Union of India and others Vrs. Mohd. Ramzan Khan); 1992 Lab. IC page 1844 (Gyanendra Nath Sharma Vrs. State of U.P.) and 1993 (I) LLJ page-738 (Fangadhar Nayak Vrs. Fertilizer Corporation of India and others), the workman has contended that when admittedly the management has not supplied a copy of the enquiry report to the workman for representing his case before the disciplinary authority the order passed affecting his service career has resulted in violation of the principle of natural justice. In that context, the management has relied upon a full bench decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in 1993 (67) F.L.R. page-1230 (Managing Director ECIL, Hyderabad Vrs. B. Karunakar). It may be mentioned here that in all the aforesaid decisions, the Hon'ble Courts have been pleased to directly consider the question of violation of the principle of natural justice in a situation as has been argued by the workman. The decision cited by the management (supra) is the latest position of law on the field. In the said decision the Hon'ble Supreme Court have been pleased to refer to all the decisions on the topic, which also includes the decisions relied upon by the workman and their Lordships have been pleased to propound that the principle propounded in Ramzan Khan's case lays down the correct position of law but because of the 42nd Amendment of the Constitution the matter relating to the second show-cause notice was given a go by and that resulted in some confusion at many levels as a result of which some authorities have not followed the practice of supplying a copy of the enquiry report to the workman. Their Lordships have further been pleased to propound that the principle in Ramzan Khan's case shall apply to the parties if the concerned law/ Standing orders governing them prescribes for a procedure of supply of a copy of the enquiry report and an opportunity of hearing before the disciplinary order is passed but where no such law or standing order is in vogue, in such cases, the practice relating to service of a copy of the enquiry report be applied prospectively and not retrospectively. In that connection, their Lordships have been pleased to make it very clear that Ramzan Khan's judgement was delivered on 20-11-90 and therefore, that principle should be followed prospectively from that date and no departmental proceeding shall be rendered as bad in law, illegal or violative of the principle of natural justice for non-service of a copy of the enquiry report if the same has been disposed of before 20-11-90.

10. On the back drop of the aforesaid legal proposition and settled principle if the facts and materials available in record will be analysed, it appears from Ext. D that the enquiry was completed, the report was submitted and on the basis of that the disciplinary order was passed by the General Manager on 27-1-90. Thus, the aforesaid ground of violation of the principle of natural justice, in this case is not available to the workman on the ground of non-service of a copy of the enquiry report.

11. In view of the aforesaid finding, Issue No. 3 is decided against the workman and it is held that there was no procedural lapses and therefore, the domestic enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner.

12. Issue No. 1 is the crucial issue so far the present reference is concerned. While considering the justifiability of the punishment inflicted and while in seisin of the matter u/s 10(1)(d) and Section 10(2A) of the Act, this Tribunal has to go into the merit of the case regarding the domestic enquiry when the truthness of the allegations has been disputed by the workman.

13. The allegations containing charges under five headings are extracted from Ext. C as hereunder :—

- (1) That on 30-4-89 at about 8 A.M. you went to Time Office of main Quarry of Bharatpur Project, incited the workers to stop work in progress and led a mob of about 100 workers who were on duty in the 1st and General shifts;
- (2) That during the incident referred to at (1), you abused Sri U. S. Upadhyay, Dy. CME/Project Manager, Bharatpur and threatened him with dire consequences and uttered "If you won't pay* IOD wages, your father will have to pay IOD wages";
- (3) That you instigated the crowd and organised gherao of S/Sri U. S. Upadhyay, Dy. CME/Project Manager and P. K. Sinha, A. C. M. of Bharatpur Project. Thus, they were restrained from discharging their lawful duties."
- (4) That, during the incident referred to at (3), you instigated the workers and shouted "Maro-Maror". As a result of which the crowd rushed forward pushing forcibly to S/Sri U. S. Upadhyay, Dy. CME/Project Manager, Bharatpur, P. K. Sinha, Asstt. Colliery Manager, Bharatpur and others.
- (5) That, during course of incident referred to at (4), Sri Jaga Behera, Dozer Operator (Tr.) and J. Chhanchani, Dumper Operator, Bharatpur beaten Sri S. Rahmatullah, Project Officer, Bharatpur while he was on duty. You abetted in commissioning of the above act."

A copy of the enquiry report has not been tendered in evidence by the management for the reasons best known to it. Nonetheless, it appears from Ext. D that the enquiry officer reported to him that charge Nos. 1, 3 and 5 were proved in full, charge No. 2 was proved in part and charge No. 4 was not proved. In that connection, the evidence of M.Ws. 1 to 3 are the relevant evidence, in as much as, they experienced the occurrence as the Officers of the management. The management has also tendered their evidence in this forum to prove the said incident and the charges levelled against the workman. On a perusal of the evidence of M.Ws. 1 to 3 it appears that such evidence besides being contradictory on material particulars is not sufficient to prove the charge Nos. 1, 3 and 5. Such facts and findings are noted as hereunder.

14. Charge Nos. 1 and 3 substantially allege that at 8 A.M. the workman went to the Time Officer, incited the other workers to stop work which was in progress and he instigated the crowd and organised a gherao against M.Ws. 1 and 3. In that connection, M.W. 1 has stated that on 30-4-89 at 7.15 A.M. he alongwith his fellow officers went to the Time Office to collect report about the previous day's work and found a group of workers present inside the Time Office were demanding payment of wages to an injured workman and were asking about the safety of the workers and at that time they were in angry mood. Though M.W. 1 tried to pacify them and directed them to go to their duties, the workers did not pay any heed to his suggestion and went on shouting at M.W. 1. From that the M.W. 1 felt that the situation may go out of his control and sent information to his Sr. Officer and in the meantime the workman arrived there. His further evidence is that M.W. 2 arrived at the Office at 8 A.M., tried to pacify the mob and failed and then suggested to make a discussion with three to four of their representatives for making an amicable settlement and at that stage the workman retorted by saying that "if he would not pay the wages as claimed, his father would pay the same". Thereafter, information was sent to the Senior most officer i.e., M.W. 3 who was then the Project Officer. When he arrived, the mob present there shouted at him "Maro Maro" and two workers, namely, Jaga Behera and J. Chhinchani assaulted M.W. 3. The M.W. 1 and other officers rescued M.W. 3 from the assault. Thereafter, the mob dispersed. In the cross-examination he has admitted about the injury sustained by a worker on the previous day but has stated that legally he was not entitled to wages for such injury because he sustained the same while returning from duty. In cross-examination he has further stated that

by the time the workman arrived at the Time Office there was a gathering of more than 200 workers, who were indulged in shouting at the officials present there. He has further stated that he does not know the reason which prompted the said two employees to assault M.W. 3 and he has admitted that those two workers (who assaulted M.W. 3) are continuing in their job. He has denied to the suggestion that after his arrival M.W. 1 commented that "You the Oriya people are Kamchor. When the Government could not provide safety to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, how the management would provide you safety".

M.W. 2 in his examination-in-chief has also substantially deposed in the manner by seeking about the presence of a gathering of labourers demanding wages for the injured workman and safety for themselves and in that account shouting and regarding the arrival of the workman at a later stage i.e., after the arrival of M.Ws. 1 and 2. He has further stated that after his (workman) arrival the workman made the same demand and M.W. 2 explained to the workman that wage can not be paid to that injured and at that, the workman in an agitated mood told that "if he would not pay the wages as claimed then his father would pay the same". M.W. 2 found the situation to be uncontrollable and informed M.W. 3. After his arrival the workers repeated their demand and M.W. 3 replied in the same manner like M.W. 2, hence the agitated workers shouted at M.W. 3 by saying—"Maro—Maro" and two of them assaulted him. To the Court's query, M.W. 2 has stated that he did not see the actual assault (on M.W. 3). He has further stated that during the whole of the incident the workman was present and he had some discussion with the workers but M.W. 2 does not know the contents of that discussion. In the cross-examination he has stated that he had complained to the management regarding the aforesaid objectionable behaviour of workman towards him. He has further stated that when M.W. 3 arrived at the spot the workman did not shout at him in the manner as he did towards M.W. 2. He has admitted to the suggestion that M.W. 3 stated (to the mob consisting of workers) that "when so much securities as demanded by the workers could not be provided to the Prime Minister, how the same can be provided to them by the management". He has however denied to the suggestion that the workman came to the spot on being requested by him and that M.W. 3 rebuked the workers saying—"You the Oriya people are Kamchor".

M.W. 3 in his evidence has deposed about the incident by stating that on receipt of information from M.W. 2 he went to the Time Office and found M.Ws. 1 and 2 having been gheraoed by the workers. M.W. 2 briefed him about the situation and the demand of the workers. M.W. 3 advised the workers to go to their work and also suggested that only three to four persons should remain to discuss with him regarding the matter and at that moment the workman and others shouted saying—"Maro—Maro" and out of them workers Jaga Behera and J. Chhinchani assaulted him by fist blows. In cross-examination he has admitted about the truck accident and the injury of the workman and the safety and security demanded by the workers and some measures taken in that behalf. The workman was present in the mob but there was no hot discussion between him and M.W. 3. He has denied to the suggestion that he abused the workers by saying them as 'Kamchor' and stated regarding on-possibility of providing security when the same could not be granted to the Prime Minister.

15. In that connection the evidence of the workman is consistent with his plea in the claim statement and to the effect that on receipt of information that M.W. 2 had sent for him he went to the spot of occurrence. On the request of M.W. 2 he persuaded the workers to go to their duties but it did not yield any result and thereafter he innocence the departmental charge sheet. He has pleaded innocence regarding the allegation of abetment, abuses and assault amounting to indiscipline and misconduct. In the cross-examination he has stated that the workers were always obeying him and carrying out his direction but on the date of incident the only occasion, when they did not pay any heed to his request.

16. The detail narration of the evidence in record is only to justify the findings which this Tribunal is going to record

on the merit of the charges. At the risk of repetition it may be stated that charge Nos. 1 to 3 are inter-linked and arising out of the same sequence. The charges signify to the extent that the workman went to the Time Office and instigated the workers. In other words, the workers who were there were not in agitated mood and it is the workman who arrived there and instigated them. The aforesaid evidence of M.Ws. 1 and 2 and particularly the evidence of M.W. 1 who was the first witness who arrived there goes to falsify such an allegation. Even if it will be treated that the charges amount to instigating an agitated mob, then also the above said evidence of M.Ws. 1 and 2 do not support the aforesaid charges, in as much as, it has not been stated by either M.W. 1 or M.W. 2 that the workman uttered any word with a view to abet the workers to abstain from their duties or to gherao the officials of the management. So far as the incident of abusing M.W. 2 is concerned, though the said two witnesses have stated that the workman told M.W. 2 that "if he will not pay the wages when your father will pay", then also it is not known under what circumstance and because of what deficiency in evidence the enquiry officer reported to the disciplinary authority that the charge No. 2 was partially proved. If a copy of the enquiry report would have been made available to this Tribunal then perhaps the correctness of the said finding could have been compared with the evidence of M.Ws. 1 and 2 and the discrepancies could have been discarded.

17. Be that as it may, even if the aforesaid evidence of M.Ws. 1 and 2 will be accepted as it is to consider the merit of the charge, then keeping in view the admitted facts that the workman is a Trade Union Leader and the General Secretary of the Union of the workers and the fact that a worker in the mines premises suffered injury due to an accident caused by a truck and for him the workers were demanding wages, it was not proper on the part of the M.W. No. 2 while facing such a mob to verbally deny to give wages. On the other hand, the matter could have been and should have been tactfully managed and the representatives from the workers could have been called for a discussion and they could have been apprised of the legal position if at all the management was insisting upon not to pay wages to the injured workman. When it was flatly refused, in that agitated mood if the workman stated something in the aforesaid manner, though the same is not appreciable, yet it can be considered as an exceptional behaviour at the hit of the moment. Neither M.Ws. 1 and 2 nor M.W. 3 have alleged that in any previous occasion the workman was behaving in indelcent or aggressive manner. By saying so, this Tribunal does not justify a conduct of abuse in the alleged manner by a person like the workman having an educational back ground. But nonetheless, the disciplinary authority who is the guardian of the workman should not have taken the aforesaid abuse so seriously so as to inflict a punishment in reducing his rank. At this juncture, it may be repeated that the evidence in record do not prove the charge Nos. 1 and 3.

18. So far charge Nos. 4 and 5 are concerned, the enquiry officer found the charge No. 4 regarding instigation to the workers for assaulting M.W. 3 as a not proved allegation. In this forum also M.Ws. 1 and 2 have not led any evidence in support of that charge. On the other hand, their evidence is clear and specific that the shout "Maro—Maro" was raised as a chorus by the workers and as a reaction to that some workers proceeded ahead and two of them assaulted. Nonetheless, M.W. 3 at this stage also has tried to implicate the workman so far that occurrence is concerned. His evidence to that effect being contradictory and not supported by M.Ws. 1 and 2 is found to be not reliable.

19. Charge No. 5 has no leg to stand so far the workman is concerned if charge No. 4 is not substantiated against the workman. In this connection, the word 'instigation' in charge No. 4 and the word 'abatement' in charge No. 5 have been used by the management connoting the same meaning. As stated above, charge No. 4 has not been proved by the management. Hence, charge No. 5 is automatically not proved against the workman. In addition to that it may further be stated that in their evidence M.Ws. 1 and 2 have not breathed a single word stating that the workman instigated or abetted or in any manner facilitated the two workers to assault M.W. 3. On the other hand, their evidence goes to show that the impulsive mob on hearing the opinion of M.W.

3 shouted at him as "Maro—Maro" and as a reaction to that a group of workers proceeded towards M.W. 3 and two of them assaulted him. Strangely enough, no action has been taken against the workers who assaulted M.W. 3, in as much as, M.W. 1 has stated that they are still in service. Thus, it is funny on the part of the department to level such a charge against the workman.

14. As per the aforesaid discussion, this Tribunal finds that charge Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 have not been proved against the workman. Charge No. 2 which is partially proved goes to show that in an agitated mood for a genuine grievance the workmen shouted at M.W. No. 2. For such a negligible misconduct the punishment awarded against the workman is excessively high and disproportionate. The management's witnesses have not stated anything against any misconduct of the workman in the past or even subsequent to the incident. On the other hand, M.W. 3 has stated in his evidence that the workman was always descent and well behaving towards him. M.W. 2 has admitted in his evidence that the demotion of the workman would adversely affect him, in as much as, in the post of Legal Inspector there is future prospect of promotion and such avenues are not available in the reverted post. It is not disputed by the parties that while adjudicating an industrial dispute u/s 10 of the Act the Tribunal can go into the merit of the findings as well as to the justification of the quantum of punishment. Thus, giving a consideration to the pros and cons of the case, the gravity of the proved charge and the conduct of the workman, this Tribunal is of the opinion that a warning to guard against such escapes in future is the just and proper punishment and the workman should be set-off with such a warning. The Tribunal comes to that conclusion and accordingly the award is passed to the effect that the disciplinary action and the punishment inflicted in reducing the rank of the workman from Legal Inspector (Trainee) to Senior Accounts Clerk with effect from 27th January, 1990 and confirming the period of suspension from 2nd May, 1989 to 27th January, 1990 is not justified and such punishment are hereby set at naught. On the other hand, the workman is treated to be continuing in the post of Legal Inspector (Trainee) throughout and in that connection, he is entitled to all his differential salary for the relevant period. Similarly, the workman is entitled to his salary for the period under suspension and after adjusting the suspension allowance paid to him the remaining part of his salary be paid to him. All such payments be made within a period of two months from the date of this Award. The workman is cautioned and warned not to exhibit any misconduct in the alleged manner as per the partially proved charge No. 2 and he be let-off with that warning. Such warning be recorded in his service record if such a record is being maintained.

15. The reference is thus answered accordingly.

Dictated & corrected by me.

P. K. TRIPATHY, Presiding Officer.

Dated: 30-6-1994.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का. या. 1970.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलोराइज कं. लि. के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012/196/91-आईआर सी (II)]

राजा लाल, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1970.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-7-1994.

[No. 1-22012/196/91-IR(C.II)]
RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
HYDERABAD

PRESENT :

Sri Y. Venkatachalam, M.A., B.L., Industrial Tribunal-I.

Dated : 8th day of June, 1994

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 33 OF 1991

BETWEEN

Sadineni Suresh, Ex-Clerk,
S/o Veerabhadram.

.. Petitioner

AND

The General Manager,
Ramagundam Area-I, Singareni
Collieries Company Limited,
Godavarikhani.

.. Respondent.

APPEARANCES :

Sri K. Subhash Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner.

M/s. K. Srinivasa Murthy, G. Sudha, M. Ananthasen Rao
and S. Suresh, Advocates for the Respondent.

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-22612/196/91-IR(C.II), dt. 22-7-1991 referred the following dispute under Section 10(1) (d)(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, RG-I Area, Godavari Khani and their workman to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. S.C. Co. Ltd., RG-I Area, Godavarikhani is justified in dismissing Sri Sadineni Suresh, Clerk Gr. II from service w.e.f. 15-3-89 without offering reasonable opportunity to defend his case? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

This reference is registered as Industrial Dispute No. 33 of 1991 and notices were served on both the parties.

2. The brief facts of the claim statement filed by the Petitioner read as follows :—

Sri Sadineni Suresh was appointed in the company on 14-6-1983 as Badli Filler in V. K. No. 7 Incline at Kathagudem. In 1985 the petitioner was allotted to the General Mazdoors duties and acquired sufficient knowledge in Clerical duties. On 13-9-1988 the General Manager of Respondent suspended the petitioner from service and issued a charge sheet against the Petitioner on 13-9-1988 alleging that, the petitioner submitted a false Degree Certificate and Memo of Marks for getting himself appointed as Clerk Grade II. The Petitioner contacted the Osmania University for enquiry about genuineness of the certificate issued by them. Even before he could get the reply an enquiry into the charges was ordered. Sri Y. Venkateswarlu, Senior Personal Officer was examined on 12-12-88. The petitioner was got examined on 18-12-1988 himself and admitted that he is not passed the B. Com. Final Year examination. But the petitioner requested that he may be reverted to his original job of general mazdoor. The petitioner was dismissed from service on 9-3-1989 w.e.f. 15-3-1989 by an order dt. 9-3-1989, without furnishing the Petitioner copy of the enquiry Proceedings, enquiry report and show cause notice. In the enquiry on 18-12-1988 and after the dismissal order dt. 9-3-1989 the petitioner made a representation to the Respondent on 12-3-1990 to reconsider his case sympathetically and revert him to the original post of General Mazdoor. But orally informed to the petitioner that the same was rejected by the concerned authorities. The action of the Respondent in dismissing the petitioner from service on 9-3-1989 w.e.f. 15-3-1989 is illegal and void. It is prayed that the Hon'ble Court may be pleased to hold that the action of the Respondent in dis-

missing the Petitioner from service w.e.f. 15-3-1989 is illegal and consequently pass an Award directing the Respondent to reinstate the petitioner into service with full back wages and grant other relief this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper.

3. The brief fact of the counter filed by the Respondent read as follows :—During February 1988, the Respondent-Management issued Circular bearing No. P(PM)4/3208/574, dt. 3-2-88 inviting the application from the candidates working in the company who are eligible to the post of Clerk Grade II. According to the said Circular, the candidate enquires possess qualifications of Graduation in Science/Arts, Commerce of recognised Universities. In response on the said Circular Sri Sadineni Suresh applied for the Clerk, Grade II post enclosing photostat copy of B. Com. Degree Certificate and marks Memo of B. Com. III Year of Osmania University. In view of his qualifications and certificates submitted by the workman he was allowed to sit for the test and interview and as he was successful candidates, Sri Sadineni Suresh was posted in Clerical Grade II post. The petitioner was a literate person and was appointed as Badli Filler and he was discharging his duties basing upon his designation. The petitioner was discharging his duties since 1985 as acting clerk is not correct. That in the Respondent company at the time of recruitment the candidates were called upon to submit the certificates as well as to submit the copies for the purpose of office and appointment orders were given to successful candidates. During probation period management will send the certificates of the candidates for verification by the Educational institutions/Universities which issued those certificates. It may be noticed that Sri Sadineni Suresh submitted a photostat copy of the B. Com. Degree and the marks Memo of III Year of Osmania University. On due verification the Osmania University authorities informed that the Marks Memo and the Degree Certificate submitted by Sri Sadineni Suresh are not genuine and that they are fake certificates. Producing the false certificates being misconduct though it is not necessary for the management to continue the petitioner in the post as he was still on probation, management initiated a disciplinary action and issued charge sheet dt. 13-9-1988 as per the Company's Standing Orders and the Conduct and Discipline Rules, i.e. under Clause 16(2) of Standing Orders and Rule (3) Section (1) of the Conduct & Discipline Rules of the Company. It is true that he made a request to the management to revert him to the post of General Mazdoors. The Petitioner has also not requested neither for enquiry proceedings nor enquiry report. The General Mazdoor's post is an unskilled post and normally preferred by uneducated people. Educated people keeping in view their intelligence and knowledge wants to opt for General Mazdoors' post on surface against the interests of the Company. That was the reason once the conduct of the employee is made out by the management it cannot venture to repose confidence in him and post him as General Mazdoor. The petitioner is not entitled for the relief prayed muchless reinstatement with full back wages and attendant benefits as prayed for. There are no merits in the petitioner's case. In view of what has been stated in the foregoing paragraphs this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to dismiss the claim petition in I.D. No. 33 of 1991.

4. The point for adjudication is whether the action of the Respondent is justified in dismissing Sri Sadineni Suresh, Clerk Grade II from service w.e.f. 15-3-1989 without offering reasonable opportunity to defend his case?

5. The Respondent contended in their counter that this Hon'ble Court may decide the validity of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue. This Tribunal decided the validity of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue and passed an order on 19-5-1994 holding that the domestic enquiry conducted in this case is not vitiated for any reasons. On 1-6-1994 the matter was posted to this day for hearing the arguments of both sides. When the matter is called the Advocates of both sides are not present. Both sides parties are called absent. There is no representation on their side. Hence the arguments of both sides are closed.

6. As seen from the above, it is clear that when this Tribunal passed the preliminary order dt. 19-5-1994 holding that the domestic enquiry is held valid and not vitiated, it is the duty of the Petitioner workman to come forward and establish that the dismissal is shockingly disproportionate with the misconduct committed by the petitioner, when the Petitioner did not come forward to establish his case after deciding

ing the preliminary issue of domestic enquiry. Hence this Tribunal is left with no other alternative except to accept the contention of the Respondent-Management. Hence the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

Award passed.

Typed to my dictation given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 8th day of June, 1994.

Y. VENKATACHALAM, Industrial Tribunal-I.

Appendix of Evidence

Witnesses Examined
for the Petitioner/Workman :
NIL

Witnesses Examined for
Respondent-Management :
M. WI P. Harigopal.

Documents marked for the Respondent-Management (on P.P.)

Ex. M1/5-12-88—Appointment Order given to the E.O.

Ex. M2/13-9-88—Charge Sheet issued to the Workman..

Ex. M3—Postal Ack. Card.

Ex. M4—Enquiry Proceedings.

Ex. M5—Fight Management documents filed before the Enquiry Officer.

Ex. M6—Enquiry Report.

V. CHALAM, Industrial Tribunal-I.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का. आ. 1971.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूच में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स सिंगरेनी कोल्लेरिज को. लि. के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुसूच में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012/36/92—आई आर सां II]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th July, 1994

S.O. 1971.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (11 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-7-94.

[L-22012/36/92-IRC-II]
RAJA LAL, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
HYDERABAD

PRESENT :

Sri Y. Venkatachalam, M.A., B.L.; Industrial Tribunal-I.

Dated : 10th day of June, 1994

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 29 OF 1992

BETWEEN :

The Vice President, Singareni
Collieries Employees Council (INTUC),
Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District
.. Petitioner.

AND

The General Manager(P), M/s. Singareni
Collieries Company Limited,
Godavari Khani.
.. Respondent.

APPEARANCES.

S/Sri A. K. Jayaprakash Rao, V. N. Goud, K. Srinivasa Rao, I. V. Ravinder Kumar and Chandrasekhar Reddy, Advocates for the Petitioner Workman.

M/s. K. Srinivasa Murthy, G. Sudha and P.V.K. Kishore Babu, Advocates for the Respondent.

, AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by its Order No. L-22012(36)/92-IR(C.II), dt. 9-6-1992 referred the following dispute under Section 10(1)(d)(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, RG-I Godavarikhani and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Management of S.C.C. Ltd., in not granting increment to Sri Ch. Raghurama Rao, Surface Fan Operator, Cat. III, Godavarikhani No. 10 Incline equivalent to the number of increments drawn by him as Electrician before having declared medically unfit for underground job, by violating term No. 17 of the Memorandum of Settlement dt. 12-3-1990 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 29 of 1992 and notices were served on both the parties.

2. The brief facts of the claim statement filed by the Petitioner is read as follows :—The petitioner submit that he was appointed in the Respondent as Electrician in the year 1931. In November, 1988 he has involved in a road accident and the Respondent declared the petitioner unfit to the post of Electrician. The Respondent have provided the petitioner with alternate employment of Fan Operator on 27-10-1989. That petitioner was confirmed in the post of Electrician in Cat. V from 5-11-1987. The Union and the Respondent have entered into a Settlement under Section 12(3) of the I.D. Act on 12-3-1990 and Clause 17 of the said Settlement stipulates that when alternate employment is provided to the employees who were declared medically unfit the pay of such employees will be protected while providing suitable alternate employment. Though

he was provided with suitable alternate employment as Fan Operator but his pay which he used to draw in the category of Electrician was not protected. Several employees who were provided with alternate employment consequent to their declaration medically unfit either by the Respondent or consequent to unfit for underground work, their pay was protected. Therefore the petitioner is also entitled for the benefit of protecting his pay that he was drawing in the post of Electrician but the same benefit was not extended to the petitioner. The action of the Respondent in not extending the benefit of protecting his pay as per the settlement dt. 12-3-1990 is illegal and discriminatory action. Therefore prays that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to hold that the action of the management in not granting increment to the petitioner equivalent to the number of increments drawn by him as Electrician before having declared medically unfit for underground job, by violating term No. 17 of the Memorandum of Settlement dt. 12-3-1990 as illegal and unjustified, and that the petitioner is entitled for protection of his pay drawn by him as Electrician before having declared medically unfit even after he is provided with the alternate job of Surface Fan Operator as per Clause 17 of Memorandum of Settlement dt. 12-3-1990 and the petitioner is entitled for the monetary benefit w.e.f. 27-10-1989 with arrears w.e.f. 27-10-1989 onwards.

3. The brief facts of the counter filed by the Respondent read as follows :— It is submitted the workman in dispute joined in the Respondent on 22-9-1978 later posted as Electrician in 1981 and from then he was working as Electrician. It is true that on 9-11-1988 petitioner got involved in road accident and later on his leg was amputated. According to the rules sent him to the Medical Board to get their opinion and said Medical Board declared him unfit to work as Electrician and because of his medical unfitness his services were terminated from 1-8-1989. Petitioner slowly got adjusted by August 1990 as such he was posted as Fan Operator w.e.f. 1-9-1990 by giving 6 months time. Thus he was working as Fan Operator receiving Cat. III wage on service. Petitioner misconstrued settlement dt. 12-3-1990 entered into under Section 12(3) of the I.D. Act. Since workman was declared unfit for underground job on 1-8-1989 and provided with alternate employment as Fan Operator Cat. III prior to date of Settlement i.e. 12-3-1990 the Clause 17 of the said Settlement i.e. protection of wages in the case does not arise and is at all not applicable as he met with a road accident but not a mine accident. The management is justified in paying Category III (Fan Operator) wages to the workman as he was reappointed on compassionate grounds. He cannot ask for protection of wage under Cat. V which is of Electrician when he is discharging duties of Cat. III i.e. Fan Operator. The petitioner is not entitled for benefit of protecting his pay though he was drawing salary in the post of Fan Operator. In view of the above, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to dismiss the claim petition with costs.

4. The point for adjudication is whether the Respondent in not granting increment to Sri Ch. Raghurama Rao is legal and justified?

5. W.W1 is examined in behalf of the Petitioner workman and marked Exs. W1 to W6. No oral or documents evidence has been adduced by Respondent Management.

6. W.W1 is Ch. Raghurama Rao. In brief he deposed that he met with an accident in the year November, 1988. Subsequent to his accident the management has given him another post i.e. Fan Operator on 27-10-1989. The management has confirmed his services as Electrician in Category V from 5-11-1987. Ex. W1 is the xerox copy of the office order dt. 25/26-10-1989 regarding the appointment as Fan Operator in Cat. III wages. Ex. W2 is the xerox copy of the office order dt. 17-1-1991 regarding the confirmation of Fan Operator. Ex. W4 is the xerox copy of the settlement dt. 13-3-1990 arrived between the management and the workers Union under Section 12(3) of the I. D. Act. When his services were taken into as a Fan operator protection of wage is not given to him. He was drawing about Rs. 2,188.94 per month. He was not given wage protection. He prays this Hon'ble Tribunal to direct the respondent to give his wage protection as he given lower post from higher post.

7. In this case there is no dispute that on 9-11-1988 the petitioner got involved in road accident and later on his leg was amputated and also there is no dispute that the Petitioner was posted Fan Operator in Grade III w.e.f. 27-10-1989 and also it is true that he was in Cat. V as Electrician prior to accident and after on an alternate employment the petitioner came to Category III. The only point that have to be decided when alternate employment is provided to the employees who were declared medically unfit the pay of such employees will be protected while providing suitable alternate employment. As per Ex. W4 Memorandum of Settlement dt. 12-3-1990 under Section 12(3) of the I.D. Act stipulates at Clause 17 read as follows :

"Employees medically unfit for underground due to reasons other than Mine accident will be considered for alternative job on surface."

In the present case the petitioner met with a road accident and he was declared unfit to work underground and he was given surface job and that too a light job as Fan Operator Grade III. The claim of the petitioner workman that when alternate employment is provided to the employees who were declared medically unfit the pay of such employees will be protected while providing suitable alternate employment. It is true that as per the reading of Ex. W4 Clause 17 it clearly states that for employees involved in Mine accidents and declared medically unfit for underground work but found suitable for surface job, all efforts will be made to offer a suitable alternative employment on surface with protection of wages. Therefore I find that the petitioner is also entitled for the benefit of protecting his pay that he was drawing in the post of Electrician, the same benefit should be extended to the petitioner. Hence I find that the petitioner is entitled for protection of his pay drawn by him as Electrician before he was declared medically unfit, even after he is provided with the alternate job of surface Fan Operator.

8. In the result, the action of the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited in not granting increment to Sri Ch. Raghurama Rao, Surface Fan Operator, Cat. III, Godavarikhani No. 10 Incline equivalent to the number of increments drawn by him as Electrician before having declared medically unfit for underground job, by violating term No. 17 of the Memorandum of Settlement dt. 12-2-1990 is illegal and unjustified. The concerned workman is entitled for grant of increment equivalent to the number of increments drawn by him as Electrician before having declared medically unfit for underground job, with effect from 27-10-1989 with arrears.

Award passed accordingly.

Typed to my dictation, given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 10th day of June, 1994.

Y. VENKATACHALAM, Industrial Tribunal.

Appendix of Evidence :

Witnesses Examined for the
Petitioner/Workman :

W.W1 Ch. Raghu Rama Rao.

Witnesses Examined for the
Respondent/Management :

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner/Workman :

Ex. W1, 25/26-10-89.—Xerox copy of office order reg. appointment of Fan Operator in Cat. III wages.

Ex. W2, 17-1-91.—Xerox copy of office order Reg. confirmation of Fan Operator.

Ex. W3, 18-11-90.—Xerox copy of Office Order Reg. giving contributions of service reg. termination from service on Medical Grounds.

Ex. W4, 13-3-90.—Xerox copy of the settlement between the management and the workman U/Sec. 12(3) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Ex. W5, 5-4-90.—Xerox copy of Office Order reg. providing alternative suitable jobs for medically unfit.

Ex. W6, 7-8-99.—Xerox copy of the last pay drawn particulars at the time of accident.

Documents marked for the Respondent/Management :

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1994

का प्र. 1972.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैमर्स सिंगरेनी कोयलाईज के लि. के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच प्रबन्धन में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक श्रद्धाकरण, हैदराबाद के पत्रपत्र को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-91 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

संख्या एन-22012/100/92-आईआरसी-II]

राजा लाल, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1994

S.O. 1977.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-7-94.

[L-22012/100/92-IR(C.II)]

RAJA LAL, Dtsk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
HYDERABAD

PRESENT :—

Sri Y. Venkatachalam, M.A., B.L., Industrial Tribunal-I.

Dated : 14th day of June, 1992

Industrial Dispute No. 44 of 1992

BETWEEN :

The General Secretary, Coal Mines
Employees Union, Hospital Area,
Kothagudem, Khammam Dist. 507101.

... PETITIONER

AND

The Chairman & Managing Director,
M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Kothagudem, Khammam District-507101.

.. RESPONDENT

APPEARANCES :—

Sri G. Veera Reddy, Advocate for the
Petitioner-Workman.

M/s. K. Srinivasa Murthy, G. Sudha,
Advocates for the Respondent.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-22012/100/92-IR(C.II), dt. 30-6-1992 referred the following dispute under Section 10(1) (d) (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem and their workman to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. S. C. C. Ltd., Kothagudem for imposing punishment on Sri T. Bhaskara Rao Ward Boy without forming and referring the issue on which punishment awarded to the Grievance Committee as per grievance procedure is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 44 of 1992 and notices were served on both the parties.

2. The brief facts of the claim statement filed by the Petitioner-workman read as follows :—T. Bhaskar Rao is a Ward Boy working in the Hospital of

Respondent. He attended his normal duties in M. S. II Ward in the 1st shift on 27-5-1991 at 7.00 a.m. Sr. Maxima has instructed the workman to watch the all bed side Lockers. After some time Sr. Maxima again ordered to get all the bedside lockers in the quadrangular area in between the wards. The workman gave the answer that as the number of the bad side lockers was large, it was not possible to him to get shifted them to outside the ward, and it would be convenient and safe to wash in the ward itself, which was usual practice since a long time. Sr. Maxima reported to the Superior Medical Officer and later Medical Superintendent called him to his room and forced him to do the instructed work. The workman refused to do so as it was not practicable and explained his difficulties. The Medical Superintendent forced to obey "the particular instruction" to get the total number of bed-side lockers cleaned and dried up in one shift. As a single workman, it was hard to clean the entire bed side lockers to get them quadrangular space clean them three and brought them back within the shift, i.e. 7.00 a.m. to 3.00 p.m. The Medical Superintendent instructed the workman to stop the work, accordingly the workman stopped and did other works upto 3.00 p.m. On 28-5-1991 T. Bhaskar was issued a Memo dt. 28-5-1991 that it was proposed to pay him the proportionate wages from 7.00 a.m. to 9.00 a.m. and the remaining period on 27-5-1991 was to be treated as absent. The petitioner submitted a letter explaining the facts on 28-5-1991. He also gave a petition under Grievance Procedure Stage-I on 27-5-1991. Instead of adopting the procedure to settle the matter under the "Grievance Procedure" under "Grievance Procedure" r/3042/1702 dt. 15-7-1972 of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited the Medical Superintendent issued a Charge-sheet dt. 28-5-1991 under Company's Standing Order No. 16(1) and 16(6). The enquiry was conducted against the principles. Even though the workman participated and revealed all facts. The enquiry was conducted by the officers and superiors of the Hospital, All of whom did not pay any attention on the words of workman. and as a result of it he was suspended from 1-7-1991 to 10-7-1991 for ten days. The workman submitted another application under Grievance Procedure Stage-II" on 29-6-1991. The C.M.O. served a reply vide letter dt. 5-7-1991 for the Grievance procedure letter Stage-II much to the dissatisfaction of the workman who requested the management to refer his grievance to the Grievance Committee in his Appeal dt. 6-7-1991 submitted under Grievance Procedure Stage-III. The C.M.O. instead of referring his grievance to the grievance committee, issued letter dt. 12-7-1991 asking the workman to submit some more clarification advising him at the same time to wait for her further action against his representation under the Grievance Procedure Stage III. Accordingly, the workman submitted a representation to the C.M.O. on 17-7-1991 as directed by her narrating the facts detailed with the prayer to refer his grievance to the "Grievance Committee". Further the workman had submitted an appeal to the C.M.O. on 24-7-1991 under the Company's Standing Orders (Item No. 17) requesting to withdraw the suspension orders in view of the facts mentioned therein. Since there was no reply from the C.M.O. for the appeal

upto 3 weeks, the workman again submitted another appeal to the Chairman and M.D. on 20-8-1991 with the prayer to intervene and do justice to him for which there is no reply. It is clear victimisation awarding double punishment i.e. marking absent and also suspending for 10 days on one and the same allegation simply because the workman is an active participant of the Union being its Vice President for Kothagudem Branch. It is against the principle of natural justice. With the personal grudges only the Medical Superintendent caused this double punishment to harass the workman. The petitioner prays the Hon'ble Tribunal to be pleased to quash the suspension order dt. 27-6-1991, direct the Respondent to pay the wages for the suspension period of 10 days from 1-7-1991 to 10-7-1991 and other relief deemed fit and proper.

3. The brief facts of the counter filed by the Respondent read as follows :—The Grievance Committee which has been evolved administratively look into mine level problems, area level problems shop level problems, day to day working problems etc. The Grievance Procedure provides stages like first stage, second stage and third stage, for redressal of grievance of the workmen. But in the case of Sri T. Bhaskar Rao, Ward Boy, the management having found his insubordination and not working during office hours initiated disciplinary action, conducted Domestic enquiry and then passed the punishment orders. Such punishment orders cannot be referred to Grievance Committee. That under the reference the petitioner cannot avail any relief as the Grievance Procedure is only a guidelines but not a statutory one. The Ward Boys have to work as per the instructions of Superintendent of Hospital, Medical Officers, Nurses and they are directly under the supervision of Nurses. Sister Maxima first gave instructions to Sri T. Bhaskar Rao to clean the lockers. Later the Supervisory authorities realised that most of the lockers are in bad condition and they are not cleaned periodically. It may be noticed that a charge sheet was issued to the workman on 28-5-1991 and the workman submitted his explanation, and not satisfied a domestic enquiry was ordered into the charges levelled against him. The Enquiry Officer conducted domestic enquiry. The enquiry proceedings have been forwarded to the management with the findings of the enquiry officer. The management found the workman guilty of the charges framed against him and gave a punishment of suspension for 10 days. The petitioner has misconstrued the procedure and seeking the relief under Grievance Procedure Code. Grievance Procedure Stage-II or the entire case of the workman does not come within the purview of the Grievance Committee. Hence it does not arise. It may be noticed that the workman in dispute having come to duty and after working for two hours he stopped the work. On the principle of No Work—No Pay, he was paid proportionate wages only for that day. Management is justified in not paying full wages on that day. The punishment is only suspension for 10 days from work. It is submitted that the reference as stated earlier is no maintainable and there are no merits in the petitioner's case and the relief prayed by the petitioner is outside the scope of reference. The Hon'ble Court may be pleased to dismiss the claim petition as devoid of merits.

4. The point for adjudication is whether the action of the Respondent for imposing punishment on Sri T. Bhaskar Rao is justified?

5. M.W1 was examined on behalf of the Respondent and marked Exs. M1 to M5. No oral or documentary evidence has been adduced by the Petitioner-workman. After examining the above witness and perusal of the records, this Tribunal passed an Order on 1-6-1994 on the validity of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue and held that the domestic enquiry conducted by the Management is proper and is not vitiated.

6. The Tribunal has to decide the case on merits. In this case on 28-5-1991 Sri T. Bhaskar, Ward Boy was issued a Memo bearing No. CHK/4320 dated 28-5-1991 that was proposed to pay him the proportionate wages from 7.00 a.m. to 9.00 a.m. and the remaining period on 27-5-1991 was to be treated as absent. The petitioner gave a petition under "Grievance Procedure Stage-I" on 27-5-1991 instead of settling the matter the Medical Superintendent issued a charge sheet dt. 28-5-1991 under Company's Standing Order No. 16(1) and 16(6). The enquiry was conducted against the principles. The workman participated and revealed all facts. The enquiry was conducted by the Officers and superiors of the hospital, all of whom did not pay any attention on the words of workman, and as result of it he was suspended from 1-7-1991 to 10-7-1991 for ten days. The petitioner submitted another application under "Grievance Procedure Stage-II" on 29-6-1991. The C.M.O. served a reply vide letter dt. 5-7-1991 for the Grievance procedure letter Stage II much to the dissatisfaction of the workman who requested the management to refer his grievance to the Grievance Committee in his grievance to the Grievance Committee in his Appeal dated 6-7-1991 submitted under Grievance procedure letter Stage II much to the dissatisfaction to the grievance committee, issued a letter dated 12-7-1991 asking the petitioner to submit some more clarifications advising him at the same time to wait for her further action against his representation under the Grievance Procedure Stage-III. Accordingly the workman submitted a representation to the C.M.O. on 17-7-1991 as directed by her narrating the facts detailed with the prayer to refer his grievance to the "Grievance Committee". As seen from the above, the petitioner workman submitted application under "Grievance Procedure Stage II" on 29-6-1991, the C.M.O. replied for the Grievance Procedure letter Stage-II much to the dissatisfaction of the workman who requested the management to refer his grievance to the Grievance Committee in his Appeal dated 6-7-1991 submitted under Grievance Procedure Stage III. That instead of referring his grievance to the Grievance Committee, issued a letter dated 12-7-1991 asking the workman to submit some more clarifications advising him at the same time to wait for further action against his representation under the Grievance Procedure Stage-III. I find that it is against the principles of natural justice. The treatment of the Respondent against the petitioner-workman is bad in law, having seen that the Respondent wilfully neglected the "Grievance Procedure"

which was constituted by itself vide Circular No. P/30-42/1702, dated 15-7-1972. It is seen that the Respondent did not follow the requirements of "Grievance Procedure" or informed the same to "Grievance Committee". It is clear case of victimisation of the Respondent. The suspension order was given under Standing Order 16(1) and 16(6) stating that it is "habitual negligence or neglect of work". But the Superiors themselves admitted that the cleaning of the entire bed-side lockers was a particular incident and particular instructions. I do not understand how it become "habitual". So having consider the entire material available on record, I am of the clear opinion that the suspension order of the Respondent dated 27-6-1991 is liable to be quashed and the Petitioner workman is liable to be paid the wages for the suspension period of 10 days i.e. from 1-7-1991 to 10-7-1991.

7. In the result, the action of the Management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem for imposing punishment on Sri T. Bhaskara Rao Ward Boy without forming and referring the issue on which punishment awarded to the Grievance Committee as per grievance procedure is not justified. The Respondent is directed to pay the wages for the suspension period of 10 days from 1-7-1991 to 10-7-1991 and the concerned workman is entitled to all other reliefs.

Award passed accordingly.

Typed to my dictation, given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 14th day of June, 1994.

Y. VENKATACHALAM, Industrial Tribunal-I

Appendix of Evidence

Witnesses Examined
on behalf of Workman :

NIL

Witnesses Examined
on behalf of Management :
M.W1—M. Ramalingeswara Rao

Documents marked on behalf of Workman :

NIL

Documents marked on behalf of Management :

- Ex. M1/28-5-1991.—Copy of Charge Sheet.
- Ex. M2/30-5-1991.—Explanation of Workman.
- Ex. M3/6-6-1991 and 14-6-1991.—Copy of notice of enquiry issued by Medical Superintendent.
- Ex. M4/29-5-1991.—Copy of notice of enquiry issued by Medical Superintendent.
- Ex. M5/28-5-1991.—Enquiry Proceedings conducted against the workman.

Industrial Tribunal-I